DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 771 SP 007 758

TITLE	Journal of Proceedings. 1973 Annual Convention of the National Association of State Boards of Education (Portland, Oregon, October 6-10).
INSTITUTION	National Association of State Boards of Education, Denver, Colo.
PUB DATE	Oct 73
NOTE	105p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; Educational Change; Evaluation Methods; *Professional Associations; Program Evaluation; *State Boards of Education

ABSTRACT

This document is primarily composed of speeches delivered at the 1973 annual convention of the National Association of State Boards of Education. The opening speech by H. Thomas Jones, President of the Spencer Foundation, concludes that the changing age structure of our population is reducing pressures on educational institutions which, in spite of doubts stirred in the '60s, are stable institutions that our society should cherish. Also included are speeches on the following topics: Educational Priorities in a Free Society, The Supreme Court and State Responsibility for Education, New State Assessment Programs, Pennsylvania's Statewide Educational Quality Assessment, The New York State Elementary and Secondary Education Evaluation System, and A New Role for the Neighborhood Elementary School. The appendixes are as follows: Minutes of Preliminary Business Meeting and By-Laws, Minutes of Annual Business Meeting and 1973-74 Budget, Courtesy Resolutions, and Policy Resolutions. (JA)

NASBE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

DEC 10 1973

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Journal of Proceedings

SP 007 758

1973 Convention
Portland, Oregon
October 6-10

ORDER OF CONTENTS

Convention Registrants

Speeches

Dr. H. Thomas James
Dr. Wilson Riles
Mr. J. Harold Flannery
Dr. Alex Law
Dr. Paul S. Christman
Dr. Thomas D. Sheldon
Virla R. Krotz
Governor David Hall
Richard L. Bye
Dr. Terrel H. Bell

Appendix I

Minutes of Preliminary Business Meeting

By-Laws

Appendix II

Minutes of Annual Business Meeting

1973-74 Budget

Appendix III

Courtesy Resolutions

Appendix IV

Policy Resolutions

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
Annual Convention - October 6-10, 1973
Portland, Oregon

REGISTRANTS

ALABAMA

Isabelle B. Thomasson

ALASKA

Betty J. Cuddy
Katherine T. Hurley

AMERICAN SAMOA

High Chief Soli Aolaolagi

ARIZONA

Stephen S. Jenkins, Jr.
David Weisenborn

CALIFORNIA

James W. Dent
Marion W. Drinker
Mark T. Gates, Jr.
Virla R. Krotz
Newton L. Steward

COLORADO

Bill Graham
Robin Johnston
Allen B. Lamb
Lewis E. Stieghorst

CONNECTICUT

Dayson D. DeCourcy
Catherine V.A. Smith

DELAWARE

Clyde Bishop
Elise Grossman
Robert H. McBride

GEORGIA

Richard Neville
David F. Rice
Mrs. A. Edward Smith
Ernest S. Whaley

GUAM

James S. Brooks
Juan C. Tenorio

HAWAII

Ann M. Nakagawa
Kiyoto Tsubaki
Hiroshi Yamashita

IOWA

Robert J. Beecher
Jolly Ann Davidson
T.J. Heronimus

IOWA (Cont'd)

Muriel I. Shepard
Georgia Sievers
John E. Vanderlinden

KANSAS

Harry O. Lytle, Jr.
Karl M. Wilson

LOUISIANA

Jesse H. Bankston
Edward S. Bopp
Frederick L. Eagan

MAINE

Sylvia V. Lund

MARYLAND

Ellen Moyer
Kathleen L. Robie
Ross V. Smith, Sr.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ramona L. Corriveau

MICHIGAN

Barbara A. Dumouchelle

MINNESOTA

Daniel F. Burton
Richard L. Bye
Mrs. Dorothea Chelgren
Lorin A. Gasterland
Ralph Peterson
Louis R. Smerling
Henry G. Tweten

MISSOURI

W. Clifton Banta
Eleanor Griffith

MONTANA

Marjorie W. King

NEBRASKA

Francis E. Landis
Shirley A. Peterson

NEVADA

Rosemary K. Clarke
Cynthia Cunningham
Reverend Benjamin J. Franzinelli
George E. Harris
Joan Kenney

NEW HAMPSHIRE

William P. Bittenbender
Donald E. Borchers
Gerard F. Cullerot
Jean S. Tufts

NEW JERSEY

Calvin J. Hurd

NEW MEXICO

Joe Romero

NEW YORK

Regent Emlyn I. Griffith
Harold Newcomb
Everett J. Penny
Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr.

NORTH CAROLINA

Earl H. Oxendine
John A. Pritchett
Mildred S. Strickland

NORTH DAKOTA

Richard Hilborn
Donald Lange

OHIO

William M. Baker
Everett L. Jung
Robert A. Lyons, Sr.
John R. Meckstroth
David R. Rittenhouse
Wayne E. Shaffer
Martha W. Wise

OREGON

Eleanor Beard
Mary Deich
Don Egge
Jeff Fasold
Eugene H. Fisher
W. Warren Maxwell
Francis I. Smith
Kenneth L. Smith

PENNSYLVANIA

Paul S. Christman
William M. Potter
James H. Rowland, Sr.

PUERTO RICO

Reece B. Bothwell
Modesto Rivera

RHODE ISLAND

Albert E. Carlotti

SOUTH CAROLINA

James M. Connor
Carlisle Hart
J.P. Kneece, Jr.
Emory B. Stoudemire
Elizabeth E. Taylor
William F. Tripp, Jr.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Ben A. Anderson
Emil A. Koehn
Judith R. Olson

TENNESSEE

Stephen Dennis

TEXAS

Joseph C. Gathe, M.D.
George C. Guthrie
Ben R. Howell
Mr. E.M. Huggins, Jr.
Jane H. Wells
Herbert O. Willborn

UTAH

A. Glenn Christiensen
Esther R. Landa
Dr. Reuben D. Law
E. Varian Mortenson

VERMONT

Arline "Pat" Hunt

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Alphonso A. LaBorde, Jr.
Sidney Lee
Joan A. Thomas
Patrick N. Williams

VIRGINIA

Preston C. Caruthers
Elizabeth G. Helm

WASHINGTON

Grant L. Anderson
Mark E. Hoehne
Eileen B. Kalles
Wanda T. Lindermann
Dr. Jack L. Reid
Robert B. Stookey
Ollie Mae Wilson

WEST VIRGINIA

Anagene P. Bartram
Perce J. Ross
E.L. Snoderley
Fountie N. Williams

WYOMING

Edward W. Hunter
Harriet E. McNeil
Lynn O. Simons

Friends of N.A.S.B.E.

William L. Austin	President, AASA - Michigan
Terrel H. Bell	Supt., Granite School District, Utah
Ralph Bohrson	Ford Foundation, New York
Robert E. Carter	Program Director, ETS, New Jersey
Howard B. Casmey	CSSO - Minnesota
Leonard J. DeLayo	Supt.of Public Instruction, New Mexico
Donald E. Dimick	Asst. Supt.of Education, Wisconsin
J. Harold Flannery	Dep.Dir.,Center for Law & Ed,Harvard Univ.
EllaMae Flippen	Secretary, Missouri State Bd.of Education
Calvin M. Frazier	CSSO - Colorado
James E. Gibbs	School Fin. Task Force,USOE,Wash,D.C.
Wm. Cecil Golden	Dept. of Education, Tallahassee, Florida
Michael J. Grady, Jr.	Grady Research Assoc, Inc.-Colo. Springs
Honorable David Hall	Governor of State of Oklahoma
Kenneth H. Hansen	Supt.of Public Instruction, Nevada
Byron W. Hansford	Exec. Secretary, CSSO, Wash, D.C.
Esonia M. Hassell	Exec. Secretary, Bd.of Educ., Virgin Islands
James A. Hazlett	Education Commission of the States, Colo.
John S. Helmick	Vice-President, ETS, Berkeley, California
Henry J. Heydt, Jr.	Spec.Asst.to State Bd. of Educ, California
H. Thomas James	President, The Spencer Foundation, Chicago
Alex Law	Chief, Office of Prog.Eval.& Res.,Calif.
Anne Lewis	Education U.S.A.
Carl L. Marburger	National Committee for Supt.of Public Schools, Maryland
Leon P. Minear	Reg. Commissioner, DHEW, Colorado
Ray B. Osburn	Coordinator, Oregon State Dept of Education
Dale Parnell	Supt.of Public Instruction, Oregon
Rev. Taylor Potter	Chaplain, Lewis and Clark College, Oregon
Wayne O. Reed	Consultant, ECS
Mrs. Frederick A. Reimers	President, NSBA
Wilson Riles	Supt. of Public Instruction, California
Charles B. Saunders, Jr.	DHEW, Washington, D.C.
Thomas D. Sheldon	Dep. Comm. for Elem.-Sec.Ed., Albany,N.Y.
Emmett J. Slingsby	Asst. Supt., Illinois
Ronald L. Smith	ECS, Colorado
Marshall Swain	Asst.Supt of Pupil Person Svcs.,Dept. of Education, Kentucky
David T. Tronsgard	Exec. Secretary, NASBE, Colorado
Harry Wugalter	Chief, N.M. Public Sch.Fin.Div., New Mexico

Address Delivered By
Dr. H. Thomas James, President
The Spencer Foundation
at the Annual Convention of the
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 8, 1973

We who work in education are fortunate, I suppose, that we have historians, who tell us about what happened in the past, and economists, who attempt to control the future, because that leaves only the present for us to worry about. Unhappily despite the order historians always are able to find in the past, and the order economists expect to establish in the future, things in the here and now, where we must live and work and make decisions, always seem to be in a muddle. And those who believe that the future can never be what it used to be are especially muddled.

Yet there are clues around us that could, if we paid more attention to them, perhaps provide us with a clearer perception of order in the present than we sometimes are able to see, I will examine five of these clues this morning and hope that you find, as I have found, some reassurance that the world we live in is likely to reveal more order to historians of the future than we perceive today. The clues I propose to examine are:

1. The rapidly changing age structure of our population
2. The extraordinary stability in our forms of schooling
3. The persistence of our faith in schooling
4. The persistence of knowledge gained from schooling
5. The persistence and stability of our traditional social values

The Changing Age Structure of Our Population

Some of you may recall that I pointed out in an article in Compact in 1968 that live births peaked in 1959 at 4.3 million, and then declined steadily to 3.5 million, indicating that if they stabilized there it would eventually mean a reduction in school enrollments of perhaps 20 percent. Live births have indeed stayed down, and had dropped further last year to 3.2 million. They are expected to be lower again this year. Not surprisingly, as I had anticipated, children who don't get born don't show up in school later. The figure I saw for last year indicated elementary enrollments were down by 460,000. This loss in enrollment will continue, will exceed half a million

this year. More importantly, it is cumulative, and cannot be turned about for at least five years. Thus if live births stay relatively stable around 3.5 million per year as they have for the past five years, or decline further, as current estimates suggest they may, the loss of clientele from the schools will indeed approximate 20 percent by the mid-1980's. My plea in the Compact article was for planning wise use of the resources released by this decline for the improvement of education, for shifting resources among levels of education, and for extending educational services. I continue the plea, and hope it will be heard more widely than it was in 1968. The dislocations we have already experienced, such as cuts in school staff, a rising over-supply of new teachers, and building shutdowns, are only the leading edge of more massive dislocations to come as schools enter a period of decline in enrollments that will persist certainly through this decade, probably through the next, and perhaps through the turn of the century. To face this decline with gloom, and to let it happen with all of its attendant consequences unplanned, seems a mad course to pursue. To seize it as an opportunity to extend educational services, now badly delivered to many age groups and communities, seems to me to offer the more rational choice and the one more likely to benefit our society in the long run. The latter course takes massive planning at all levels of government, and some of the federal funds could be helpful in this task.

Some observers have likened the baby boom following World War II to an ocean wave, and indeed as we find ourselves off balance when struck by a great Pacific swell, so the educational establishment was caught off balance in the 1950's and '60's as the rising enrollments pushed up the need for housing, staff, and costs of operation. So now, as we begin to catch our equilibrium at the top of the wave, as we consistently underestimated the rapid rise in school enrollments we are again inattentive to the decline already setting in, and again may lose our balance. As our teacher training programs were too slow in turning out the teachers needed on the buildup, and we were faced with shortages for two decades, so now they are too slow in cutting back training programs, and we are faced with an increasing over-supply each year in the number of teachers, administrators, and most kinds of specialists in education. As this wave of children that overwhelmed the schools moves into the world of work, our productive institutions doubtless also will be slow to adjust, but we can expect steady and substantial increases in the labor force that will in turn expand the taxable incomes and properties, so that a much larger revenue base will be available for supporting the declining enrollments, with attendant reduction of the individual's burden for the costs of schooling.

So while we were unrealistically hopeful in the 1950's about our ability to cope with the problems of education in the 1960's,

it seems to me that current discussions in education are unrealistically gloomy about our ability to cope with the problems of the '70's and '80's. The worst is over, but if historians will show, as I expect them to, that most of our problems of the past decade stemmed from sheer numbers of students overwhelming our schools, so the decline of those numbers should promise great improvement in the effectiveness of schools in the years ahead. We will be able to reduce the crowding which has raised the anxieties and stirred aggression in students as predictably as it does in experiments on rats, and it should increase the attention that can be given to individuals which in turn should reduce the feeling of anomie, of loss of identity about which we heard so much in the 1960's.

Attendant upon this passing of the post-war wave of children will come other reductions in the costs of social services, for while this wave was creating problems for schools it was also pushing up our needs for housing, for hospitals, doubling the rates of juvenile delinquencies, swamping our custodial institutions, multiplying accidents of all kinds, and in general multiplying the costs of other local government agencies as well as schools. These statistics, too, are beginning to decline, with predictable stabilization and perhaps reduction ahead for other governmental costs as well. In spite of the dire predictions in the late '60's about counter-cultures and revolution, the young people in the leading edge of the wave are now moving into solid and productive adulthood, surprisingly conservative in their views, better educated than the generation they follow, and in general, startlingly attractive to their older colleagues who a few years ago were inclined to fear them. In sum, I am inclined to conclude that the changing age structure of our population makes the future look much brighter than it was only a few years ago.

The Stability of Schools

I turn now to the second clue to the state of our times, the extraordinary stability in our forms of schooling. Much of the new money flowing into schools from foundations and from the federal government was aimed at producing innovations and changes in the schools, but the statements of the specifics to be changed were oddly incoherent. Schools should be more humane (most are more humane than the inhuman ones), they should be joyful, and they should be "open" (whatever that means). President Johnson gave us program planning budgeting systems, and the Office of Education taught us a new catechism to go with it so their economists could understand what we were doing---decide on objectives, allocate resources to accomplish them, measure the accomplishments, and do cost-benefit studies

to see how we can do better next time the cycle comes around. Since the administration changed in 1968 the terms of discourse had to change, too, so we have heard little of PPBS since then and more about accountability (whatever that means, and it seems to mean everything, or nothing, depending on who's talking). But the catechism is the same--decide on objectives, allocate resources, measure accomplishments, and, through cost-benefit analyses, improve the next cycle. No one can argue with the simple-minded logic of these proposals. Neither has anyone, to my knowledge, found a sensible way to follow the prescription at the school district level.

Accountability has become one of the most ubiquitous buzz words in education, and happily for all of us, its widespread use as is usually the case with buzz words in education is probably a signal that it is about to go out of style. I call it a buzz word because it means many different things to many different people, and for those who seriously try to define the term it fades and fades as one tries to move closer to its meaning. At its best it appears to mean that schools should define their tasks, and report on how well those tasks are achieved. At its worst it seems to depend on pupil performance on achievement tests, and serve the general expectation of parents that all children should be above average. Yet behind it is a deep concern that schools serve children well in a large number of poorly specified ways; that they be orderly in going about setting their goals and measuring their achievements; that they be responsive to the diverse demands of their many constituencies; and that it do all these things in ways that build public trust. It's a large order, perhaps too large for an institution, such as the school, that was standardized long ago, because the diversity of demands made upon it by the very diverse sub-populations it serves make virtually impossible a clear statement of goals and clear standards for performance.

Changes we have had in schools, as a result of great pressures over the past decade, and unquestionably more are needed. Yet not all changes being proposed are needed in all schools, and so proposals for universal change are nonsensical. A school mirrors the community it serves, and it changes only in response to the expectations of the community it serves. Change is a two-sided coin and the other side is stability. The lesson to be learned from our experience with the federal and foundation money directed to changing the schools is that as long as we have local boards of education the money will be used to satisfy local expectations, which may lead either to changes satisfactory to them or to stabilizing or extending existing services. We hear of the taxpayers' revolt, of bond issues turned down, and tax increases rejected, but without good information from the past to compare it with, because we

weren't keeping national scores on these matters twenty years ago; and we hear only about the turndowns, not about how many wrong-headed proposals were presented to the people by school administrators still locked into the syndrome of planning for growth. New schools we will need, as populations shift, and for replacements, but few for growth. We hear a great deal about fanatical attacks on the schools by the radical right or left, religious zealots and atheists, racists and integrationists, do-gooders and casual meddlers; few schools in America can be looked at over time without revealing a succession of what might be called critical incidents and crises. Yet I repeat, to say the whole system of public education in this country is in need of change is arrant and irresponsible nonsense. Instead of crying for unspecified innovation and change across all schools, we need to capitalize on the great potential for stability in the schools. This stability allows school boards and administrators to function in orderly ways toward introducing the specific changes needed in specific schools to meet the expectations of specific communities, while recognizing and mediating the pressures from state and national governments that reflect our societel commitment to racial justice and quality education.

The Persistence of Our Faith in Schooling

We are being bombarded in recent years with the assertion that schools aren't very important. This notion, powerful in influence in the last century, has been given new life in the past decade by such romantic writers as Ivan Illich, and even supported by certain interpretations of such research findings as Coleman's and Jencks', and again is particularly influential. Yet Illich's proposal for deschooling society is less revolutionary than would be the society he hopes would emerge, which is one with sharply lowered expectations for material, technical, and spatial comforts. No such society would be acceptable to even a small percentage of our people. Even the 100,000 alienated middle-class youth of the '60's, who have dropped out to form the 3,000 "new life style communities" scattered across the country are unlikely to persist, except where powerful religious conversion is involved. Schools go on performing their traditional function of escalating children up through the socio-economic classes, and few among the lower levels and deprived minorities are confused either by romantic talk, or plausible research. They know that to know how to do something may assure them a job, but they'll always be working for the guy who knows why. The socio-economic escalator runs two ways, and those among the children of the upper- and middle-class who choose to drop out provide the counter-flox that makes room at the top for children of the lower socio-economic groups who persist with their education. We live in a vastly complex technological society with insatiable demands

for knowledgeable people to keep it running, and with an overwhelming majority dedicated to keeping it running. If the reservoirs of middle- and upper-middle-class children who were expected to run it reject the discipline and refuse to achieve the knowledge necessary, then another reservoir will be tapped and the hard-working children of blue-collar parents and less privileged ethnic groups will be gathered into the roles of the new elite. Revolution we may have, but not the kind of violent revolution talked about by present-day romantics; rather its progress will be marked by the orderly selection of qualified people, whatever their background. Furthermore, the school in this function is performing well the task that was dreamed for it when state school systems were first established in our country.

That our faith in schooling is strong in spite of five years of romantic and radical attacks upon it is further revealed by the fifth annual Gallup Poll of public attitudes toward education, published in the September Phi Delta Kappan. To the question, do you think your child is learning what you believe should be learned, 82 percent said yes. To the question, does your child go to school because he wants to or because he is required to, 83 percent said because he wants to. To the question, how important are schools to one's future success, 95 percent answered extremely important to fairly important. To the question of whether children were getting a better education than those questioned, 61 percent of the total said better, and of those who were parents of children in public schools, 69 percent said better. Asked what the biggest problems in schools are now, the top three mentioned were lack of discipline, integration-segregation conflicts, and lack of financial support. Asked what makes today's education better, the top three replies listed first better curriculum, second better facilities, and third better qualified teachers.

It's hard, reading these responses, to feel that the schools are in crisis, or out of favor with the public. Rather, in sum, it would seem more reasonable to say that the faith of our people in schooling is strong, and that again, the future looks better than it did in the '60's.

The Persistence of Knowledge Gained from Schooling

Lest someone suggest that faith in schooling is not enough, we recently obtained some hard data on one question about schooling that certainly seems important. Schooling is supposed to increase knowledge. The question asked by Professor Herbert Hyman of Wesleyan University was: What evidence can we find in surveys of the adult population that additional years of schooling add to the knowledge of adults, and how long does

such knowledge endure? He sought his answers in a secondary analysis of surveys of large and representative samples of the national population over the past twenty years, extracting from them the data needed to answer these questions. He found not a single instance where the college graduates are not the most knowledgeable group, not a single instance where high school graduates were not less knowledgeable than the college group, nor more knowledgeable than the elementary group. Furthermore, any waning of the effects of education in old age that might occur, never goes so far as to reverse or even equalize the superiority of knowledge of the better educated group. Finally he concludes that in our high schools, and even more so in our colleges, the information-gathering habits lead graduates on to search for and accumulate new knowledge. Thus while the differences persist, sharp and distinct, between those who stop with elementary school, high school graduates, and college graduates, over time the level of knowledge is rising at all levels, and the old dream of a learning society may no longer be the impossible dream it once seemed. So to the extent that we are concerned about the knowledge implanted by schooling, the faith indicated by the polls seems to be justified by Professor Hyman's research, a reassurance for the present and a source of new hope for the future.

The Persistence and Stability of Our Traditional Values in Education

One can look at values as expressed in early American statements about schooling and perhaps despair that our traditional values are fading. Yet it is easy to overlook the fact that the terms that were used in those earlier days are transformed into new terms which yet convey the old meanings.

The concern for piety meant that children must be taught to read in order to study the Bible and grow in religious faith, spiritual mindedness, temperance, purity, righteousness, and charity, and thereby join the elect, those to be saved after death, the children of God.

The concern for civility involved teaching of good manners and deportment, prudence, courtesy and thoughtfulness, gentleness, tolerance, and graciousness toward others.

Educational writings of the 18th century reflected the growing impact of the enlightenment upon the popular consciousness. Piety, seculiarized, became "virtue"; the concept of civility became "citizenship", reflecting a growing interest in the political philosophers who thought the importance of education lay in its development of the capacity for self-government; and more emphasis was placed on knowledge considered scientifically and morally useful. The Northwest Ordinance of 1787 combines the earlier aims of 17th century education and the new emphasis of the 18th in its opening words: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government, schools, and the means of education shall be forever encouraged."

The concern for morality persisted as part of the curriculum throughout the 18th century--in fact, late into the 19th, notably in the McGuffey Readers. That the concern is still with us is evidenced by the resolution recently adopted by the American Association of University Professors meeting in St. Louis, and headlined as an act of contrition. I quote from the resolution, for it is a restatement of an older concern now deeply stirred by the Watergate scandal:

> "The 59th Annual Meeting of the American Association of University Professors profoundly regrets the Watergate scandal and is alarmed at the breakdown in law and order, the decay of public morality, and the excessive permissiveness of which this incident is symptomatic.
>
> "That all the persons allegedly involved in this felonious and fraudulent affront to freedom and fair play are graduates of American institutions of higher education, causes us to grieve that we failed in not helping them to overcome their character defects and asocial and larcenous propensities while they were in our tutelage.
>
> "Having the courage and humility not to cover up our past wrongdoing, we urge that university professors confess their sins of omission and combat the tragic example given to their students by lawyers who allegedly flout the law and administrators who allegedly manipulate the trust. We dedicate ourselves to trying harder to steer this generation of students away from a life of crime and toward an enhanced respect for the Constitution, justice, and ethics."

It is a pity these concerns have been so long dormant, and one hopes their reawakening will be effective. I see signs that some kind of a reawakening in our schools is imminent, and may well be one of the emerging priorities for schools in this decade, with Professor Lawrence Kohlberg of Harvard University giving early leadership to the effort to teach moral values.

In the 19th century the industrial revolution created a new expectation for the schools, that is, that they teach children to be productive. With its connotations of fruitfulness, creativity and ingenuity, gainful employment and investment, productivity is perhaps best epitomized in the Morrill Act of 1862 establishing the land grant colleges, and in succeeding efforts to encourage vocational education and manpower training that have continued right up to the present Congressional deliberations. In the Gallup Poll mentioned earlier

90 percent of the respondents said schools should give more emphasis to a study of trades, professions, and business to help students decide on their careers.

Our own century continues to use and develop aims of the past. Piety, virtue, or "ethics," implying the effort to find a moral basis for action is still a broadly recognized aim today. Certainly the old concept of civility is still with us, if evidenced only by the persistent cries for its restoration to discourse and relationships in the present. We unquestionably still promote as a goal the pursuit of knowledge, the intellectual or "cognitive" aspects of education, adding to this a concern--perhaps new, perhaps only a version of piety and civility--for the capacity to feel and to empathize. Our concern for good citizenship and self-government are, if anything, stronger than ever before.

In some ways the old aims are adapting to a new world. The aim of citizenship is reaching out from narrow community concerns to a deeper national and international consciousness and to a new awareness of the environmental consequences of our actions. Although the concern for productivity persists, broadened in our own century by a balancing concern for rational consumption and worthy use of leisure time, in light of our population growth and other economic, social and natural changes, it must be nearing a major transformation; young voices of dissent, at least, tell us so. Our curricular choices in the last two decades show a deeper concern for justice in the distribution of social and economic benefits than earlier; and judging from our recent graduates, the lessons have been well-learned. In these days there seems to be a special need, above all, to teach hope, for in this virtue our current graduates seem sadly deficient. And while we have made some progress, we need to extend our efforts to have schools conducted more humanely, to make them happy and joyful places to be.

These, then, are some of the traditional aims of education in our society, with some speculation on those emerging. I think no one can seriously argue that any of the concepts is irrelevant in our time. One can argue that they are global concepts derived from philosophy and religion, and therefore of little use in an age that seeks to define its educational objectives in behavioral terms. My reply would be that these aims do describe behaviors--how a human being treats his neighbors, the actions he takes part in and approves, what he initiates in his own life. I was with these aims for education in mind that state legislatures enacted the laws that established the state school systems throughout the

19th century and into the 20th. More important, it is in terms of these aims that the larger controversies and criticisms of the schools are still phrased. We can stir national concern about how Johnny can't read, but when citizens meet in their local communities to discuss the problem, the discussion shifts to Johnny's behavior, his dress, the length of his hair, his morals, his religious attitudes, his values, and what he's thinking of doing with his life. And it is in terms of these aims that the educational leaders, the programs, the faculties and the students of schools of the future will be judged.

In spite of the upheavals in schools and colleges in the 1960's, a recent survey conducted by Leonard L. Baird for Educational Testing Service found, that the goals of college seniors in 1971 were much more like those of seniors in 1961 than they were different. They chose various careers for the same reasons that were cited in 1961, and they expected the same kinds of economic, intellectual, and personal returns from their careers as their predecessors. In the next few years Professor Hyman will turn his attentionto the study of the enduring values implanted by schools, and again I expect his findings to be reassuring.

Summary and Conclusion

I come now to a summary of those clues to the state of education at this time:

1. The changing age structure of our population is reducing the pressure on educational institutions and we are entering a period of sharp declines in school enrollments, with attendant reductions of pressure on many other social service agencies. We need to plan how to improve and extend educational services to communities and groups in our society now not well served.

2. Despite doubts stirred in the '60's, schools are stable institutions in our society and this very stability is an asset to be protected, for it is our best assurance of an orderly and productive approach to the changes that are needed to adapt schools to the changing needs of the communities, and of the larger society they serve.

3. The faith of our people in schooling is high and we need to place as our highest priority in education on seeing to it that the faith is justified.

4. The schools do indeed increase knowledge and we have data soon to be published by Professor Hyman to show how systematically and how broadly they do so.

5. Despite the turmoil of the '60's our traditional values are probably not being endangered by schooling; however, mounting evidence from many sources that the moral fabric of our society has been weakened suggests that a high priority for the years ahead will be strengthening the teaching of moral values in our schools.

Finally, in conclusion, let us not be confused about deschooling society, for the society we live in demands enormous inputs of educated people, and the link between education and income will hold in the future, as it has in the past. The rise and fall of elites in this country will be determined in large part by the choice of youth who accept or reject the opportunity to be educated.

Address Delivered By
Dr. Wilson Riles
State Superintendent of Public Instruction
at the Annual Convention of the
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 8, 1973

Educational Priorities in a Free Society

Good morning.

This moment is an honor for me --- and also a valuable opportunity. I am eager to communicate with and learn from this group of leaders in education from all parts of the nation.

But I must admit that there are some pitfalls in the process of communicating, particularly when individuals from different regions of the country face each other.

We have different challenges facing our different state and local educational systems. And, of course, people from different parts of the nation express themselves in different styles and terms.

I was very much aware of that yesterday as I boarded a plane in California to come here. The stewardess put her message this way -- and I took it down verbatim:

"May I have your attention, please, for a few minutes. I'd like to point out the safety features of this aircraft. In the seat pocket in front of you, you'll find a blue card. It describes the safety features and emergency exits. There are two emergency exit doors on each side of the aircraft -- one in the front and one in the rear. Now, for take off, make sure that your seatbacks and tray tables are in the upright and locked positions. Please refrain from smoking until advised. Thanks for your attention. We hope you have a pleasant flight."

I had been in Texas a few months before, and on that flight the stewardess simply said this:

"Honey, you'all buckle your seat belts 'cause we gonna take off."

My message to you this morning about priorities in education stems from the idea in this quote from Wordsworth:

"A child, more than all other gifts
That earth can offer to declining man,
Brings hope with it, and forward-
looking thoughts"

Education leaders throughout America are today expressing one point of view which implies that every student is expected to succeed, and that the schools have the responsibility to make it happen.

Formerly, students were expected to assume the burden for what they could get from their school experiences. Schools provided "offerings" and "opportunities." A school was considered good if it had a good program, whatever that is. If, somehow, some pupils did not do well in that program, the fault was theirs, not the schools.

We are now moving closer to a realization that the schools and their pupils are mutually interdependent and mutually accountable. This symbiotic relationship suggests that pupils be active, rather than passive in the instructional processes. that they rightly challenge some practices and content. One wise observer has said: They are saturated with information and starved for experience, preoccupied with the present, scornful of the past, and dubious of the future.

We need to reach the 3 R's, rediscovery, rededication, and responsibility. America needs people who not only can do, not only people who believe, but who also act responsibly in behalf of themselves and their fellow man. Competence, dedication to values, and participative citizenship.... these are the imperatives of freedom, and public education is the heartbeat of freedom.

A school board deals constantly with three basic questions which affect policy decisions about budgets, personnel, buildings, instruction and other perplexing problems. The questions are:

1.--What should learners be able to do?

2.--What should learners believe in?

3.--How should learners act to enhance freedom?

Education has been instituted to make tomorrow's promise today's actuality, to make "what should be" happen sooner than it would in the absence of education. To each of the above questions, the word "when" should be added:

What should learners be able to do, and when?

What should learners believe in, and when?

How should learners act to enhance freedom, and when?

How these questions are answered will influence the organizational structures of schools, the proper responsibilities of each of the levels, and the responsibilities of the learners themselves.

What is the responsibility of a school board? One key responsibility is to serve as a strong link between the schools and the public.

Here is one suggestion for priority action by every board of public education to meet that responsibility.

To prepare, publish and distribute to its constituency the first of a series of annual reports describing the learning accomplishments and needs of the population which it serves, including projected plans for improvement.

This report to the public would include:

A reaffirming of the board's commitment to education for freedom.

A statement of what the board believes it is responsible and accountable for.

A statement of the educational goals and objectives which give direction to the school program.

Verifiable evidence of the extent to which these goals and objectives were accomplished in the preceding year.

Verifiable evidence that public funds have been used effectively and efficiently.

Verifiable evidence that the school program is responsive to emerging needs and opportunities.

A statement of what the board holds its learners accountable for.

A statement of the board's priorities for the next year, including plans projected and resources needed.

A statement of the means by which the public may communicate to the board its approval, criticism or suggestions for the improvement of the quality of education.

By such action, local boards can do much to strengthen public confidence in its schools.

The public has a right to know what it is getting for its money.

If public education is of the people, by the people, for the people - the people have the need to know.

If the public schools are to be free, that freedom must be safeguarded by an informed public.

The public has collective responsibilities, also --- best expressed through school boards. Since the public establishes, maintains, supports and gives direction to the schools, it is appropriate that, in relation to public education, some priorities be suggested for action by the public. Here are nine:

1--The public reaffirm its commitment to free public education as an imperative to American freedom.

2--The public direct its various levels of governance (federal, state, local) and their branches (legislative, executive, judicial) to confirm their commitment and accountability to assuring high quality public education for all segments of the population at reasonable cost.

3--The public reaffirm its belief that public education is best served by local boards of education which are elected by, and responsible to, the local electorate, within a system which is supported by a combination of local, state and federal funds.

4--The public reaffirm that is has established free public education as an institution which has as its primary purpose the safeguarding of American freedom by learners who are competent, who are committed to American values and who exercise their competencies directed by such values as responsible citizens - individually and collectively.

5--The public reaffirm its determination that it will provide public funds to public education governmental units as the basis of demonstrated effectiveness and efficiency.

6--The public reaffirm its mandate that public education be stable in purpose but flexible in operation so that it properly reflects both the stability and the dynamics of freedom.

7--The public reaffirm its belief that learners and the public education enterprise are mutually interdependent, and therefore the public properly expects effectiveness and efficiency on the part of learners as well as of the public educational system.

8--The public reaffirm its understanding that the public schools, although vital to freedom, constitute only one institution, and that the schools are interdependent with other public institutions in pursuit of life, liberty and happiness.

9--The public reaffirm that man and his environment are mutually interdependent over time and that freedom requires both a short term and long term perspective for public education.

All of us must remind ourselves, humbly, that our ultimate priority is to serve the child --- the single, individual, growing, changing, independent, dynamic child. In our work, there is no real human value or meaning in approaching "masses or millions," or in concentrating on "societal needs," or in being preoccupied with cosmic ideals. It is the child, only the child, each child who stands as the reason for the entire educational system.

Educators won't be able to shake the dust and clear the cobwebs away from some of our new, though noble, concepts about "individualized instruction" or the "uniqueness of each child" unless we remain aware of an enduring truth about children and learners.

The child has something to say about what he or she will learn and about what he or she will become. Educators won't ever fully control the child. Schools can never program the entire future life of the child. And we should not succumb to the comfortable notion that we are grandly and charitably and patronizingly "helping" the child.

The child, the student, is not a passive recipient of our adult gifts and offerings. The child is the force, an active human force, deserving of the chance to make choices, with the right to be heard.

A friend of mine told me recently of a conference arranged at school to discuss a problem involving his ten year old son. The boy had suddenly become uncooperative, cranky, distracted and failure-prone in his class work. The conference was well-arranged. The mother and father were there. The teacher was

there. The principal was there. The school district counselor was there. And the boy was there. All of them, appropriately, were present at the meeting to discuss the boy's problem.

The adults in the room jabbered away for forty-five minutes, discussing everything from the pre-natal eating habits of the mother to brilliant new theories about behaviour modification. Finally, when they all paused for breath, the boy spoke up quietly:

"I don't know what all this big deal is all about," he said. "But I've been wanting to tell you that I've had a splinter in my big toe for three weeks and maybe that's the problem."

Yes, we must all seek to perfect educational techniques, polish methods, refine instruction and distill into practice our expertise.

But my final message is that we must also listen to the child, hearing the fine, natural, innocent wisdom which resides in each child, the wisdom about himself which only he possesses.

If we presume to be leaders for education, we must remain learners. That's what education is all about. We must learn from the child.

Thank you.

Address Delivered By
J. Harold Flannery
Center for Law and Education
Harvard University
at the Annual Convention of the
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 9, 1973

The Supreme Court and State Responsibility for Education

I am feeling some kinship with the history major who was confronted on his comprehensive examination with a long essay question about the industrial revolution. Having missed his guess about the exam, he took the bull by the horns (perhaps in every sense) and began his answer by noting that the history department might be equally interested in a chronology of the kings of England.

I hope to do somewhat better by my assigned topic. But I view the judicial decisions referred to, and others like them, as straws in a larger wind, namely, state-level responsibility for public education. So with your indulgence I propose to discuss the cases--Bradley, Keyes, Robinson, and Rodriguez--in that context. Specifically, I would like to share with you a lawyer's thoughts about some of your prerogatives and obligations.

I should acknowledge, coming from Massachusetts, that I live and work in the shadow of the Boston School Committee, which marches to its own dissonant drum. Indeed, if it were not for the occasional visibility of our able recent Commissioners, now Greg Anrig and before him Neil Sullivan, few of us would know at all of our State Board of Education. But as some of you know, I have worked elsewhere as well. So even allowing for the present distortion of my perspective, I think it is not an exaggeration to say that generally, with respect to vital issues of educational policy, the SEA proposes and the LEA disposes. In almost all states critical spending decisions are made locally without regard to whether the funds, or particular percentages of them, are raised locally or from state or federal sources. Options with respect to the assignment of pupils and teachers, programs and materials, and buildings and busing may be subject to nominal state-level constraints, but they are actually exercised locally.

To me, these truisms are not inherently either sinister or mysterious. Local control is what the American Revolution was all about, and it has remained a cherished thread, not

without reason, through our history. It is true in constitutional theory that the states possess significant residual powers in contrast to a limited central government, and in the 19th century public education was spurred at the state level. But whether one concludes that educational powers were delegated to localities (as states surely may do), or never in reality surrendered by them, that is where the action has been. Moreover, there are modern forces at work to maintain that tradition. I probably need not remind you that state legislators tend to think in terms of the interests of their usually few and similar constituent school districts rather than collectively of a state system. Lawyers have tended to bring their cases against local districts based on their perception of where the power as well as the grievance lies. Similarly, I view the Administration's proposals concerning revenue sharing as reflective of the vitality of this notion. Some of us may see revenue sharing as unworkable or worse, but it does represent a widespread conviction, which I share, that not all goodness and wisdom concerning citizen well-being repose in Washington. So, too, while some may find Boston an unfortunate example of this principle, it is neither incomprehensible nor unprecedented that its citizens believe that they care more and know better about the educational needs of their children than do the majority of non-Bostonians who comprise the state legislature and board of education.

In sum, at the risk of laboring a fairly simple point, I think we should begin our consideration of the role of state boards of education with a frank acknowledgement that for largely historical reasons it is not pivotal and that there are very real obstructions to it becoming so. But the winds of change may be blowing, and if so the judicial decisions we shall discuss today relate to them.

Court cases are part of the flow of history, they have antecedents and progeny. Brown v. Board of Education was a stunning decision, but it was also the culmination of almost two decades of case development, and it has certainly spawned innumerable progeny. Much the same is true of the reapportionment cases and the problems to which they were addressed. So to understand our cases, and their possible implications for your role, let us ask first what gave rise to them.

I suggest that reallocations of power in our society occur as a response to the failure of existing institutions and arrangements to cope effectively with problems. The SEC rises from the ashes of self-regulation by the securities industry; poverty among the elderly overwhelms private charity and local public resources, and the social security system is instituted. Therefore, if Rodriguez and our other cases have

something to do with your power role, and if I am correct in my suggestion, then the decisions are far more than judicial fulminations or political theorizing in the academic sense. Moreover, I think the history of other judicial developments teaches that, if the problems which these decisions represent are serious and worsening, then the cases may be among the first but they are by no means the last of their kind. Put bluntly, today's decision about institutional power and responsibilities will be revisited if the problem to which it is addressed is then perceived to worsen. The Supreme Court spoke in Plessy v. Ferguson, but not for the last time.

Let us look in that light at the problem(s) represented by the cases and how they relate to you. The cases begin with a quite particular version of the question whether our public schools are serving well, or at least fairly, our children. Parenthetically, let us put aside other versions that our inquiry does not involve. It is not an Ivan Illich v. Albert Shanker debate. Each of them can point to some of his pet examples, but I doubt that public schools generally are either an unmitigated wasteland or a collection of minor miracles. Nor, if that were the question, is there any reason to believe that judges are equipped to answer it. Next, the cases do not involve misinterpretations of Jencks to the effect that the question is unimportant because schools do not matter anyway. And lastly, our version of the question is not significantly affected by how one ranks the cognitive and affective roles of schools. Overall, therefore, while we are able to document that schools are less effective for some particular groups of children than for others, and while the actions might not have been brought if the results were otherwise, the cases basically involve inputs more than outcomes, opportunities more than results, and arrangements more than consequences.

These cases involve per pupil expenditures and the racial composition of schools, and the effects of such factors, if any, are surely important. They have to be weighed in evaluating the rationality of other arrangements, such as school district boundaries, that interact with them. But for our present purpose--analyzing the issues from a legal standpoint--put aside any supposition you may have that plaintiffs must prove that segregation is harmful or that there is a particular correlation between dollars spent and educational outcomes achieved. Instead, assume with me (if only because it is largely true) that the courts long ago decided that official segregation is illegal, and that systematically to spend differing amounts of money upon identifiable groups of pupils without reason is also illegal.

Turning now to the cases, Rodriguez and Robinson involved the constitutionality of school finance arrangements in Texas and New Jersey. In those states as elsewhere schools are financed primarily by local property taxes with supplements from state and federal sources. As parents of poor children living in poor districts, i.e., districts with relatively little taxable wealth per child, the plaintiffs complained that the system is unfair, a denial of equal protection of the laws. Their reasoning was that in such districts even heroic property tax rates often fail to yield the education dollars per pupil derived from lower rates--less effort--in wealthier districts. Furthermore, they pointed out, not only do state funds often fail to equalize the initial disparity, their per pupil allocation formula sometimes worsens it. Because education is a constitutionally fundamental right, their argument concluded, the state must do what it can not, namely, show that it has a compelling interest in the present scheme or, in other words, show that there is no feasible, more fair alternative available.

Note carefully, if you will, the plaintiffs did not ask that the local property tax be struck down as a basis of school financing; nor did they ask that the state guarantee equal education dollars for all its pupils. Rather, they argued that the dollar value of a child's education should not depend upon the fortunity of where he lives, and that an equal effort, i.e., a given tax rate, should yield equal fruits across the state. Plainly, education-conscious districts would still be free to spend more dollars per pupil by taxing themselves at a higher rate.

The three-judge federal court agreed with the plaintiffs, and in the light of similar decisions in other states a trend appeared to be developing.

Texas appealed the case, and in March of this year the Supreme Court reversed the judgment of the district court by a vote of 5 to 4. Mr. Justice Powell's opinion perceived a difficulty with the class of plaintiffs, one can not be sure that poor children live in poor districts. Next, and more importantly, he concluded that education is not a constitutionally fundamental right, and thus that these state arrangements with respect to it would not be subject to the exacting judicial scrutiny of the compelling interest standard. He observed that Texas state funds were some effort toward equalization, that there are doubts about the relationship of dollars to educational quality, and that the evidence did not show that anyone was being denied a minimal basic education. He concluded, in sum, that the denial of equal protection involved did not reach the magnitude of unconstitutionality.

Scholars more knowledgeable than I, such as Professor John E. Coons at Berkeley, have argued that the Court was wrong in its result and unpersuasive in its reasoning. To me the result can best be explained by surmising that President Nixon's appointees, joined on this occasion by Mr. Justice Stewart, viewed the case as a vehicle for the philosophy of judicial deference to legislative discretion and local control. Certainly none of the majority defended the Texas scheme as efficient or fair. Unfortunately, however, as Professor Coons points out, there is little reason to look to state legislatures for solutions; they are part of the problem. Moreover, local control is not genuine among unequals.

Meanwhile, luckily for the principle involved, other litigants had chosen the seemingly less promising forum of state courts and among them were the Robinsons. The arguments were basically the same, but the result as you know was not. The New Jersey Supreme Court noted the Rodriguez decision, but noted also that its own Constitution requires "a thorough and efficient system of free public schools for the instruction of all children in this state." And it concluded that not only does the system deny equal protection (unless one assumes that the poorest district is a proper standard of adequacy), but also that it cannot be called "thorough and efficient" by any reasonable definition.

Many of our states" constitutions refer specifically to education in terms more or less like that of New Jersey. Consequently, while there is some risk of a guilt of inconsistent adjudication, as distinguished from a uniform national standard under the Federal Constitution, the likelihood that the issue will remain alive in the courts is to the good.

Bradley, the Richmond, Virginia school desegregation case, presents a different facet of state responsibility for schools. There are other pending cases like it, including Detroit, Indianapolis, and Hartford, and most of the following considerations apply similarly to them. The question in these cases--the effect of desegregation requirements upon school district boundary lines--was not born yesterday, so let us look briefly at some recent judicial history.

In an American case in the nineteen-sixties the federal court of appeals held that school district lines could not legally be gerrymandered to cause or maintain racial separation of pupils. Last year the Supreme Court held that changes in district boundary lines which would impair required desegregation are not permitted even where it can not be shown that causing or maintaining segregation is the dominant purpose involved in the change. Meanwhile, another line of cases,

involving districts that were resisting desegregation, was developing the principle that the states bear responsibility for seeing to it that their subdivisions, including school districts, live up to the Constitution.

In sum, as this decade opened several important building blocks were in place: first, the Constitution speaks to the states, it does not recognize school districts or other political sub-divisions as autonomous or sovereign entities; secondly, upon a finding of illegal segregation the Constitution requires the appropriate authority to reconstitute schools so that they are not racially identifiable; and thirdly, school district boundaries are state decisions to which constitutional standards and judicial reviewability apply.

The district court in Richmond held that the city and its suburban neighbors were components of--in constitutional terms--a state school system; that Richmond's schools (70 percent black) could not be made racially unidentifiable by any conventional standard, and certainly not by comparison to their more than 90 percent white neighbors; and that various policies on the part of state authorities had contributed to rendering Richmond and its suburbs racially identifiable as districts. On that basis it ordered that all schools in the relevant area be desegregated, subject to practicability limitations based upon travel times and distances. It ordered, in short, that district boundaries, as artifacts of state convenience not based upon educational considerations, not stand in the way of students' rights to a desegregated education.

The court of appeals reversed the district court. It reasoned that Richmond's suburbs had themselves met applicable desegregation requirements, that there was no evidence that the boundary lines had been created or manipulated in order to segregate Richmond, that school districts, whatever their constitutional standing, have a long tradition of de facto independence, and therefore that the suburbs need not participate in the desegregation plan. The Supreme Court by a divided vote (4 to 4) declined without opinion to hear the case, and a petition for reconsideration is pending. Although it is fascinating to conjecture about the Court's declination, all that can be said confidently is that it voted not to hear this case at this time.

I referred to the Detroit case, and it is worth considering briefly because the court of appeals for that circuit upheld the district court's metropolitan desegregation ruling. Two theories seem to underlie the court's conclusions. First, the State of Michigan operates a school system, divided for convenience into units, for which it is constitutionally

responsible. Where its agent, the Detroit system, has practiced illegal segregation, then the state is ultimately obliged to provide to all Detroit children racially unidentifiable schools--which it cannot do in a system more than two-thirds black. Of course, if the state can provide such schools in a district as it exists, then it may do so. But if it cannot, then it must do so (within practicability limitations) by disregarding its self-imposed constraints--district boundary lines--which are themselves not based upon a compelling educational or other interest.

Secondly, the plaintiffs argued that the state and its other agents should participate in the remedy because state policies had in fact contributed to Detroit becoming an identifiably minority district. In short, that the state was liable not only upon a theory of remedy but as a participant in the violation as well.

The state and suburban districts have asked the Supreme Court to review the case, but that request is premature in that the specifics of a desegregation plan are subject to further litigation in the trial court.

The Denver case, Keyes, does not directly involve state level responsibility. It is significant, however, as the Supreme Court's first full opinion on Northern school segregation. The district court had found some schools in the system to be illegally segregated and others to be minority isolated but fortuitously so, or not illegally. It ordered that all be desegregated, including the fortuitously isolated, because the latter schools were also under-achieving, which the court found to be a denial of equal protection.

The court of appeals affirmed the district court as to the illegally segregated schools, but reversed as to the innocently isolated schools, holding that educational quality was not judicial business, an avoidance of the outcomes question.

The Supreme Court did not address the outcomes question either. Rather, after affirming both courts as to the deliberately segregated schools, it held that too lenient a standard had been applied to the other racially identifiable schools. School districts are unified entities in its view, so where some significant illegal segregation is found a strong presumption, which the district must rebut, arises that all segregated schools in the district are illegally so. There will be further proceedings in the district court, where it is unlikely that the system can meet the burden of rebuttal prescribed by the Supreme Court. Moreover,

it is probable that the comprehensive standard of relief growing out of the Southern cases will also be applied to Denver.

I think these cases are significant for you in a number of ways, but before turning to that I would like to reemphasize the judicial focus upon inputs rather than outcomes. Note that in Denver the Supreme Court did not debate or analyze the educational unwisdom of racial segregation. Rather, its premise was that deliberate segregation is a priori illegal. Schools as a matter of law may not be organized that way, and the task became one of enunciating the proper standard to be used in evaluating the facts. I read the majorities in the Emporia, Scotland Neck, and Detroit cases similarly. It is true that Rodriguez mentions questions concerning the relationship between dollars spent and educational quality, but I do not read that as the basis of the Court's judgment. And if I read the Robinson court correctly to say that, whatever are the critical variables in providing equality of opportunity, let us at least minimize tangible and controllable disparities, I believe that is the sounder view.

The parties' arguments and judicial opinions in these cases raise many more issues than they resolve. There is, however, at least one consistent thread that is significant for you. Almost without exception the parties and the courts view public education as a function which the states are responsible for conducting upon constitutional terms. The states have wide latitude in discharging that obligation, as to both substance and manner; that is, as to what education will consist of and by what arrangements it will be carried on. But the obligation to fulfill constitutional requirements, while delegable, may not be avoided by a sort of shell game in which one state agency after another declares itself powerless to remedy wrongs. The states may prefer to guarantee that their units perform constitutionally or they may choose to act centrally or through different, more promising arrangements. But state discretion as to arrangements is not conclusive of constitutional rights. The judicial task of balancing is a delicate one, but where rights are circumscribed a state's obligation to justify arrangements to that effect is a heavy one.

Therefore, I believe that, increasingly, courts will say to state agencies, such as boards of education, you must use the powers that are yours in the following ways to accomplish specified objectives. Moreover, your state constitution and laws, which are not the only sources of your obligations, are also not the only source of your powers. You embody the states' responsibility to the Federal Constitution, and the

states may not fail their obligations by circumscribing your powers. Thus, you may be ordered to exercise certain responsibilities that would not, absent an underlying constitutional obligation and default, be yours under state law.

I am aware of the overtones of judicial usurpation in that projection, but there are grounds to believe that confrontations will not materialize. As in the reapportionment cases, courts tend to defer to state legislatures for possible solutions for a decent interval after existing arrangements are found to be invalid. And legislatures, rather than permit apolitical strangers to prescribe remedies, tend to respond, although sometimes more or less grudgingly.

In any event, and perhaps this is my lawyerly bias, I know of no institution in our framework better than courts for that mediative role. Unless, perhaps, state boards of education would undertake on their own to act creatively and affirmatively.

Thank you.

Address Delivered By
Dr. Alex I. Law, Chief
Office of Program, Evaluation & Research
at The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 9, 1973

New State Assessment Program

California state testing has been changed by a new law which became effective in March, 1973. Although some aspects of the state assessment program remain unchanged (for example testing will still be done in grades one, two, three, six and twelve), there are significant innovations that will be of interest to educators in the field.

Purpose of the State Testing Program

In the past, the state administered the tests to try to provide information for a wide range of audiences: state legislators, district administrators, program planners, classroom teachers, and the general public. In trying to meet the needs of such diverse audiences, ranging from the need of teachers for very specific diagnostic information about students to the more general needs for an indication of education's attainment statewide, the testing program did none of its jobs very well.

The stated intent of the new law is that state testing should be directed toward broad program evaluation rather than the diagnostic assessment of individual students. A state testing program can best be used to identify strengths and weaknesses of educational programs. It cannot meet the classroom need for individual diagnosis, which is the responsibility of each local district.

One fundamental change under the new law is that California may develop its own tests rather than adopt a specific standardized test. This aspect of the new program is of concern to those who will ultimately be affected by the testing program.

Developmental Process for New Tests

This new testing program will involve the administration of a baseline test to grade 1; a reading test to grades 2 and 3, and general subject area tests to grades 6 and 12. The primary justification for spending time and resources at the State Department of Education for developing new tests

is that they can be made more relevant to California's needs than commercially available tests. Considerable effort, therefore, has been devoted to the specification of objectives that the tests should assess. The steps in the process of test development are outlined below:

1. Assemble objectives

Although it would be possible to begin by writing objectives for each subject area, there would be considerable duplication of effort, and the objectives might not be appropriate for all schools in the state even if the authors were chosen from throughout California. It was therefore decided that objectives should be collected from the following sources: California state frameworks, textbook scope and sequence charts, commercial test publishers, and school districts in California. On October 26, 1972, a letter was sent to county superintendents asking for copies of sets of objectives developed by their offices or information as to which districts had developed objectives. Copies of these materials have been obtained.

2. Combine objectives

A subject area specialist for each area was employed to aggregate the sets of objectives into one comprehensive list. The specialist needed to coalesce the diverse wordings of very similar objectives into a single statement of pupil performance.

3. Select relevant objectives

Committee members were selected to represent the following groups: school district curriculum specialists, teachers, offices of county superintendents, State Department of Education task forces, and professional associations and experts in the academic community. The committee discarded objectives which it felt were not important or relevant to California school districts. A comprehensive list of objectives were identified for each subject area.

4. Verify objectives

The final set of objectives for each subject area and grade level was sent to a random sample of districts to receive feedback for further improvement. All school districts in California were asked to respond in depth at some phase of this validation process. In addition to being selected for a specific subject area, each district was given the opportunity to review and comment on all of the objectives.

5. Select test items

The State Department of Education will contract with a number of test publishers to provide test items from their item pools matched to the set of objectives. The subject area advisory committees will meet to verify the content validity of the items (determine whether they are appropriately matched to objectives). Items will also be evaluated in terms of their statistical properties.

6. Subject test items to minority critique

Items will be reviewed by representatives of ethnic and economic minorities to eliminate those items that are culturally biased--for example, reading passages in which vocabulary more familiar to one cultural group than another is used. Although it is not possible to construct "culture free" tests, considerable effort will be devoted to developing tests that are "culturally fair."

7. Field test

Before they are printed, the tests will be field tested to ensure that directions to teachers and pupils are clear.

8. Develop a sampling plan

The law requires that every student in grades one, two, three, six, and twelve be tested. However, with the exception of the test for grade one, a matrix sampling procedure will be used whereby each student takes only a part of the total test. Statistical experts have helped in developing a sampling plan appropriate to the size of each school and district. In general, however, pupils in smaller schools will take a longer test than pupils in larger schools. The sampling plan will be constructed so that in all but the very smallest schools the total testing time will be a 50-minute period or less. In grade one, each child will take the entire test, but it will be approximately 30 minutes long, which is consistent with the shorter attention span of pupils beginning the first grade.

Purpose of the Baseline Test for Grade One

One of the unique features of this comprehensive assessment program is the development of a baseline test for students in the first grade. The purpose of the test for grade one is to assess the skills children possess when they come to school.

This assessment will provide a basis for making judgments about the progress of schools and school districts on state achievement tests. In the past, the scores for each school and district have been compared with the state average regardless of initial differences in pupils readiness to learn or of differences in school resources for instructional programs. In the future, reports of test results will also reflect demographic characteristics such as poverty index, financial characteristics such as assessed valuation, and pupil charactersitics such as socioeconomic level and mobility. The most important variable to be used in the analysis will be the results of the test for grade one. As a measure of basic skills, it will provide an indication of initial readiness.

Why Make Comparisons at All

Whenever the intention of the new state testing program is stated, questions invariably arise. Why make comparisons? Why should the California State Department of Education compare local schools and districts when each has its own special problems and unique curriculum objectives? The answer is that judgments about achievement statewide require some sort of relative standard. Using criterion-referenced measures, districts can gain significant information about how well they have met the objectives they set for themselves. Nevertheless, comparative information of a more general nature can also be useful feedback for program improvement. The test for grade one should make the feedback for program improvement. The test for grade one should make the feedback provided by achievement test results more meaningful by allowing comparisons with similar districts and schools rather than with state norms.

Legislation requires the reporting of test scores for every school and district. It is possible to meet the requirements of the state assessment law without interpreting results or making comparisons. But past experience has shown that comparisons are inevitably made, especially by the Lay public and the media, often without sufficient background for valid interpretation. A good reason, then, for collecting baseline data and making comparisons as part of the state report is to prevent misinterpretation and to guarantee that each school's results are evaluated in terms of a realistic expectation for that school.

Using Other Factors to Calculate Expected Scores

The statistical method that is to be used to calculate expected scores is a complex analysis commonly referred to as a regression analysis. Regression analysis begins with the correlation between two variables; that is, the baseline

test for grade one and the variable to be predicted, reading achievement in grade three. Rather than being compared with all schools in California, each school is, in effect, compared with only those schools achieving the same score on the test for grade one. Although the correlation of the test for grade one with reading achievement in grade three makes comparisons among schools much fairer, additional variables (also correlated with third grade reading) will improve the interpretation further. In addition to pupil readiness, the analysis will take into account student mobility, socioeconomic factors in the community, and financial resources of the school. Each school and district will find itself in a special category of comparison of similar schools and districts. Thus, multiple regression analysis makes possible consideration of the unique aspects of each school by comparing it to its own expected score rather than to the scores of a large group of schools with only some aspects in common.

Address Delivered By
Dr. Paul S. Christman
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 9, 1973

Pennsylvania's Statewide Educational Quality Assessment

Let me begin by acknowledging my appreciation for being able to participate in this session of NASBE. My purpose here today is primarily to bring to your attention -- and hopefully to briefly explain -- Pennsylvania's achievements in its statewide assessment of what young people are learning.

Let's look first at how it all started.

In 1963 Pennsylvania's General Assembly was preparing to enact legislation requiring school district reorganization. Legislative hearings on the bill included many arguments for and against enforced reorganization. The expression "quality education" figured prominently in these presentations. When witnesses were requested to define the phrase, the number of different interpretations approached the number of individuals testifying. In consequence, Act 299 included the following mandate to the State Board of Education:

> "...to develop an evaluation procedure designed to measure objectively the adequacy and efficiency of the educational programs offered by the public schools of the Commonwealth" and "...to provide each school district with relevant comparative data to enable directors and administrators to more readily appraise the educational performance and to effectuate without delay the strengthening of the district's educational program."

To carry out this mandate, the State Board of Education appointed from its members a Committee on Quality Education. This Committee explored the subject in depth and, after meeting with civic and professional leaders from across the state, secured the adoption of the Ten Goals of Quality Education by the State Board in 1965.

The adoption of these goals was the first major contribution made by Pennsylvania to the assessment movement in that it shifted the emphasis away from the measurement of student achievement in basic skills only, to the acceptance, and inclusion, of such vital aspects as self-concept, understanding differing others, interest in school and learning, citizenship, health habits, creativity, vocational cognizance, appreciating human accomplishments and preparation for a changing world.

Stating a goal is one thing, developing instruments to measure performance is quite another matter. In 1967 a Bureau of Educational Quality Assessment was established within the Department of Education and during the succeeding two years an assessment model -- measuring instruments, procedures for collecting data, computer analytic techniques and basic reporting procedure -- was developed and tried.

Measuring total student performance which can be realistically related to the adequacy of the educational program requires a design which takes into account other conditions which contribute to that performance. Information such as the unique school and community characteristics which affect him were also collected.

The first actual assessment of schools was performed in October 1970 with 110 voluntarily participating school districts comprising 533 individual schools and 50,000 students. In the succeeding years of 1971 and 1972 these totals of volunteers reached 302 of Pennsylvania's 505 local school districts, 1,441 separate schools and 184,000 students enrolled in one or more of the four grade levels for which measuring scales had been developed -- grades 5, 7, 9 and 11.

Reports of assessment findings are presented and interpreted to local school district personnel by Department of Education teams who travel to the participating districts. The findings are reported as:

1. The average pupil performance level on each goal for each school.

2. A comparison between the average pupil performance level in a school and the average performance level for all Pennsylvania schools at a specific grade.

3. A comparison between the average pupil performance level and an expected (or predicted) level which takes into account those conditions -- home, school

and community -- which impinge upon the educational program.

4. Identification of goal sub-areas which appear to be most amenable to improvement.

Aggregated findings are made available to Department of Education personnel and the legislature.

Where do we go from here? Two recent developments -- one an action by the State Board of Education and the other by the Secretary of Education -- indicate future trends.

On September 14th the State Board of Education announced its intention to pass a resolution at its next regular meeting in November 1973 which will require all Pennsylvania school districts to be assessed at some time within the next three years. Voluntary participation will be continued but those few reluctant districts will be put on notice that by 1976 they will be included. The purpose of this action is to provide the legislature reliable annual estimates of statewide results every third year.

The second development was the expanding of the educational quality assessment staff in mid-summer to permit the establishment of a unit to identify and develop promising educational practices which can be tried by local school districts who wish to improve student performance levels in specific aspects of particular goals.

Address Delivered By
Dr. Thomas D. Sheldon
Deputy Commissioner for Elementary,
Secondary, and Continuing Education
at the Annual Convention of the
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 9, 1973

The New York State Elementary and Secondary Education Evaluation System

For the past three years the New York State Regents and the State Education Department have been restudying extensively the evaluation of elementary and secondary education. Three major items have been of particular importance in this review. One is the studies and report of the State Examination Task Force on evaluation. The second is the report of the New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education (the Fleischmann Commission). The third factor is the requirement of the State Education Department to report annually to the Legislature on the evaluation of urban education projects.

In November 1972, the Regents proposed as a part of their recommendations for changing the distribution of state aid to the public schools that funds in the amount of $1.4 million be allocated in Fy 1973-74 to the Education Department for use in evaluating elementary and secondary education programs funded from all sources and with particular attention to the evaluation of programs for the disadvantaged in relationship to the total school program. The State Legislature eventually provided $940,000 to develop and implement the evaluation program described here.

Under date of April 10, 1972 the Commissioner of Education provided his recommendations with respect to State Examination Task Force recommendations to the Board of Regents. His recommendation that the Department should establish an integrated system for assessing the effectiveness of elementary and secondary schools in New York State was accepted by the Regents.

While recommending that the Regents accept this proposal, the Commissioner pointed out that the Department was engaged in a number of activities to begin building an integrated system at that time, but warned there should not be any naivete with respect to what the Department possessed which could become a part of such a system.

New York collects each year a great deal of Basic Educational Data System (BEDS) information and other reports as to activities in the school districts. The State is well advanced in terms of information as to student performance, but recognizes it has very little in terms of behavioral outcomes. Performance information results from general testing at the third, sixth and ninth grades in the mathematics and reading skills areas and from Regents examinations results which as presently utilized reflect testing of the above average and average students who pursue the Regents course of study in the secondary school.

The above are cited simply to emphasize that establishment of the desired integrated system was not regarded as a simple undertaking even in a State with a long and proud history of State-level student testing. The State Examinations Task Force report had cited Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) tests as being a reasonable basis for development of the system, but they too are focused on certain specific objectives and disregard much of the important instructional area. These tests also presently have the disadvantage of being administered only at three year grade intervals. It was predicated that a reasonable accountability system should enable local school districts to assess their performance at all grade, subject and behavioral levels at much more frequent intervals so that difficulties and strengths could be pinpointed and remedied or incorporated to advantage as soon as possible.

It was deemed proper not to preclude inclusions or guarantee exclusion of any facet of the present examination system which a committee might wish to consider for use in the development of the integrated system envisioned. Department studies took such an inclusive approach.

There were other recommendations with respect to Regents Examinations, per se, their use and other matters, some of which were held in abeyance for consideration in connection with the basic charge.

The staff had received and studied applicable portions of the aforementioned Fleischmann Commission Report. The Recommendations of that Commission with respect to concentration on a common core of learnings from pre-school through the early secondary years were particularly compelling, and the Commission suggestions as to the possible substitution of standardized secondary level examinations for the Regents examinations seemd to deserve formal analysis through trial and experimentation. From time to time suggestions as to the advisability of minimum competency testing in connection

with award of a high school diploma had also been received and advanced,

The New York State Education Department is required to provide the Legislature an annual evaluation as to our Urban Education programs, funded with $47,000,000 of special State funds. Test evaluation experience as well as comments from the Legislative staff with respect to itk have furnished valuable information as to how the Legislators and their associate view this problem.

A general assessment of the various studies and presentations which had been reviewed and their applicability in the context of New York evaluation needs was presented. Even though that assessment indicated that evaluation sophistication was not all one would wish it were, particularly in its incapacity to provide the Regents and citizens with information as to the effectiveness of schools in the affective domain, the Regents concluded they should adopt certain basic principles for refinement and incorporation into programs to be implemented in the 1973-74 school year.

It was our feeling that any evaluation system addressing itself to particular projects or experiments should fit into the general evaluation context applicable in the complete school setting. With that in mind the staff set forth a suggested testing format which would allow us to compare our students' performance in the various schools and with schools in the State and across the Nation. A second element would include measurement and certification of levels of competency of our students. It was felt that components of the first two programs could be utilized for project evaluation purposes, particularly as test results were cross-referenced to identifiable environmental and instructional variable factors.

The proposals below, which were accepted by the Regents, are based on the premise that schools, particularly the elementary and junior high schools, are regarded by the citizens primarily as instruments to develop cognitive skills in our students. In no way should the recommendations be regarded as negating the important humanistic and behavioral aspects of our work. These latter, although much more difficult to measure, must continue to receive strong emphasis. The program endorsed contained the following elements:

TESTING THE GENERAL STUDENT POPULATION

In the Fall of 1973 we began to collect standard test information from all schools on all pupils grades 3 through 8. Schools are being asked to report their results as tested by recognized Achievement Tests. By and large collection of these data at the local level

is present standard practice and thus does not impose exceptional new costs or time burdens. Such information is being collected on a school-by- school basis in the two areas of reading and basic mathematics skills. Schools are asked to report on their entire school population and separately as to those pupils who spent the entire previous instructional year in their particular school.

We continue to administer the math and reading Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) tests at grades 3, 6 and 9 and will establish median relationships of these test scores to medians from the standardized tests utilized.

The Department will also administer State Regents Examinations in the secondary areas either as comprehensive final examinations or on a subject-by-subject basis as seems most appropriate in each area of study. At the same time we have established an experimental standardized secondary testing program and will relate these standardized test subject results to Regents examinations results and thus test the feasibility of Fleischmann Commission recommendations that these latter be replaced by standardized testing.

Optional State Regents examinations based on State curricula in areas of study not presently tested will be offered to school districts for their use and for Regents Diploma purposes. With respect to the Regents examinations a collection of scores and information for general status purposes is being emphasized. Such information on a personal basis can also be useful in school counseling, but it was suggested that its pass-fail application be downgraded. However, no change in the requirement for passing specific State examinations in connection with receipt of a State Regents Diploma is contemplated at present.

It is important to collect certain general pupil and school related information together with the standardized and State test information. New York has been studying relationships between PEP test scores and pupil-school-environmental factors in a program entitled Performance Indicators in Education (PIE). For the present endeavor we expect to collect and relate socio-economic factors such as Warner Scale of occupations and one or two school related items such as per-pupil expenditures for operational purposes and education of faculty.

Initially a collection system based on resources available to schools and the State is being utilized.

Obviously, this must largely be based on simple paper reporting formats. So far as possible the system mirrors the collection and reporting schema in use presently. However, as will be noted later, it is also proposed to begin to develop a pupil file for every student in the State.

GRADUATION STANDARDS AND CRITERION REFERENCED TESTS

A program new to New York, although reminiscent in some respects of former State Preliminary Examinations, involves basic competence level examinations being administered to all students subsequent to the end of the eighth or ninth grades in the four areas of English-language arts, social studies, science and mathematics. It has been recommended that a level of acceptable accomplishment in each area be established and that students have the opportunity to try or retry these examinations at any time in their senior high school careers. A certificate of competency can be issued based on successful completion of the four basic examinations and can be used independently or as a floor requirement for local and State diplomas.

The social studies examinations will concentrate in the civics-citizenship-economics areas, and the sciences in practical consumer sciences, environmental sciences, drug and health education.

Results on the competency examinations have obvious implications for secondary school programming. They can provide a basis for decisions as to continued basic and general area course provisions for students requiring such continued instruction. Additionally, as was the case with the former Regents preliminary examinations, the competence test format can be developed as a criterion referenced approach and test results used individually, locally and Statewide for determining areas of program strength and weakness.

PROJECT EVALUATION--URBAN EDUCATION, TITLE I ESEA

In connection with Title I ESEA and Urban Education Compensatory programs, the Commissioner has established two basic cognitive priorities in the area of reading and basic mathematics and a third priority where applicable, in bilingual education. In order to assure that State and Federal objectives are met in these programs which serve pupils having special educational needs related to poverty,

particular evaluation measures are needed. It is proposed that the bilingual education program be evaluated partially in terms of tests other than those requiring use of the English language, i.e., mathematics and/or science and social studies. These examinations should be given in the language in which the student is most proficient. Increase in English proficiency will be tested per pre-and-post instruction language dominance tests.

Evaluations of special projects as currently performed by local educational agencies (LEA's) and their consultants have had limited impact on improving instructional management in local school districts. Accordingly a portion of the funds allocated to the Urban Education Program and currently used by LEA's for evaluation purposes will be used to develop improved evaluation results through improved instructional management systems. Initial emphasis in system implementation will be on standards (Do project proposals satisfy professional standards with regard to the quality of objectives; quality of program design; appropriateness of test instruments; and the likelihood that evaluation information will be used for within school-year and between school-year decision making?) and strategy (Do the results indicate that one type of project serves educational disadvantaged students better than other types of projects?) Some evaluations of Urban Education projects in reading and mathematics will be made through development of an instructional evaluation system (LES). This system will be developed eventually to permit the valid and precise evaluation of instructional projects in other study areas. In addition, we plan that LES ultimately provide information system capabilities required for the cost-effective management of instructional resources, and for the support of planning and decision-making processes at both the State and local levels.

An integral part of an IES would be a set of program impact test instruments designed to determine whether the expenditure of resources in the program had been accompanied by a reduction in the total need to which the program is addressed. These tests would measure student progress toward minimum adult reading and mathematics skill levels. Without such measures, program impact evaluations of reading and mathematics programs cannot be carried out. Therefore, our recommendations included the development and/or selection of tests of adult reading ability, i.e., reading effectiveness measures. Once reading ability relative to required adult skill levels can be measured, tests of mathematical ability relative to required adult skill levels could similarly be developed or selected.

The intention of implementation of IES is to provide more and better information to students, parents, communities, the Legislature and the Governor for the same sum of money that has been provided to local school districts through the urban Education Program to permit the evaluation of all reading and mathematics projects supported by special project funds.

In addition, in two community school districts in New York City and possibly in one upstate region, we propose pilot projects through which locally developed mastery tests related to Urban Education projects are administered through the IES and the IES is used to assist with local monitoring and instructional support of the projects.

In subsequent years, IES would be implemented incrementally in all districts throughout the State and additional effectiveness measures developed.

An IES consists of a computerized reporting and evaluation system that is integrated into ongoing activities in local districts. The New York State Education Department has acquired rights to flexible software system which has unique features. The system will allow LEA's to build pupil, program and personnel files as part of ongoing administrative and instructional activities. With this system, LEA's can record comprehensive information on their instructional programs as well as information needed for administrative and reporting purposes (e.g., attendance, scheduling, transcripts, and reports to the community, parents, students, the State, and the federal government). Presently, to fulfill reporting requirements, most LEA's must either manually lift data from many paper filing systems or ask teachers to provide the information. In either case the burden is much too great, especially for teachers. Furthermore, such "survey" procedures to recover manually filed data are inefficient, and often result in inaccurate reporting.

The unique features of the system which the Department proposes to implement include:

- capability to handle extensive amounts of data on students, programs or personnel at reasonable cost;
- capability to add or delete elements of information at will without redesigning the system (thus users are not locked into fixed data files);
- capability to produce a variety of reports (users can change the format and content of reports and "massage" data from many files at will);

capability to enter data easily as part of ongoing operations.

The IES would in addition provide a set of procedures for systematically developing or assembling instructional activities and mastery test items linked to program objectives; measuring student performance with mastery tests, and interpreting test scores using predetermined performance criteria; reallocating instructional resources (e.g., materials, teacher time) to improve student performance; and recording instructional activities, objectives, and test scores to provide a basis for upgrading program content and evaluating instructional performance over time.

The New York State Regents approved of the general directions indicated here last January and direct ed that the Department move on the further study and refinement processes. In so moving we consulted with Department staff, with representatives of the teachers' associations, with representatives of the administrators organizations, and with many educators, legislators and laymen. These processes have been completed, and the recommendation of these groups having been taken into consideration, the programs are being further developed and implemented with the assistance of a special allocation provided by the 1973 State Legislature for these purposes.

Address Delivered By
Virla R. Krotz
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
Banquet
October 9, 1973

Distinguished guests on the dais and in the audience, fellow members and friends of NASBE:

In the first place, I want to thank Oregon - the State Board of Education and the State Department of Education-for the splendid convention which they have arranged for us. Would they all please stand so we can show them our enthusiastic appreciation. Thank you! They have done far too many things to be enumerated here but I do want to mention the buffet table Sunday night which was one of the most outstanding that we've ever seen including that beautiful large salmon. Then Oregon Night on Mt. Hood is something we will be talking about for years - sunset on the snow of Mt. Hood, planked salmon Indian style and their many clever honorary awards. Portland lived up to its title "City of Roses" with this beautiful rose centerpiece at the head table, the lovely corsages provided to the women in the receiving line and the red rose for each lady present. This is the largest Convention in the history of NASBE with approximately 250 registered and they handled every detail smoothly and well. These capable people even controlled the weather.

In Abraham Lincoln's first public speech in 1832, he said "Upon the subject of education -- not presuming to dictate any plan or system respecting it, I can only say that I view it as the most important subject which we as a people can be engaged in."

Before that Benjamin Franklin said "On education all our lives depend -- and a few to that -- too few with care attend."

That is the importance of the task to which we as State Board of Education members have been appointed or elected. Writers, thinkers, yes -- and even parents and citizens in general have long realized the importance of education. They are critical of its progress -- eager to look for a scapegoat to blame and anxious for its success. We, as State Board members, find ourselves in the middle of this situation.

As Martin Luther said in the early 1500's "The prosperity of a country depends, not on the abundance of its revenues, nor

on the strength of its fortifications, nor on the beauty of its public buildings; but it depends on the number of its cultivated citizens, in its men of education, enlightenment and character." Our country certainly needs this kind of citizen. Can we, as the educational policy-making organization in each state, meet the challenge of providing them? We must try.

What is the role of the State Board of Education? It varies from state to state but a common thread runs through all. We are the designated policy-making body for education either constitutionally or statutorily. That is a tremendous responsibility. Are we filling it? Are we decision makers or a rubber stamp for the superintendent or Legislature? Do we leave a vacuum? Because if we do, it will certainly be filled by someone else -- or even more to be regretted, leave our state without educational progress and leadership. Our Board agendas contain so many routine items which must be attended to. Are we merely attending to these and meeting each crisis by reacting to it instead of furnishing leadership that acts before a crisis develops? In some states we are the ribbon cutters and corner-stone layers for education buildings. That's not bad! It's fun, somewhat glamorous, and improves the visibility and image of the state board and of education. Goodness knows we need that, too. However, that's not enough. That's not educational leadership. But we haven't time for everything, you say. That is very true. There is a saying which I like.

"Time is like a pipeful of tobacco. Pack it too tight and you can't draw anything good through it; fill it too loosely and its fire goes dead."

And that is the reason for priorities. We can't do everything. We must set our broad long time goals for education in our state -- decide on priorities in reaching them and set policies to make this possible. This is the theme of our convention -- "Priorities and Goals of Education." You are hearing many eminent people, far more qualified than I, speak on this. However, as a foundation for this and to get you thinking about it before coming to this convention, I wrote to each state with a State Board of Education and asked if they had established priorities and how they had ranked them. A few more have reported since I mentioned this in my September FOCUS article. However we would like to hear from all states before a compilation is made. Many educational agencies have asked to receive this. As soon as the balance of the states have answered my query, we'll compile the results and print them in FOCUS.

This is one advantage of belonging to NASBE. You can compare the progress of your State Board of Education with others. This is an important reason for attending NASBE Conventions. In our reactions and discussions after the various speakers -- both before the entire audience and individually in conversations -- you can learn from the achievements and mistakes of other states. I hope each one of you will make a real effort to talk with someone you've never met before. You'll learn a lot and make new friends as well. One of the most rewarding aspects of NASBE to me has been the fine friendships made. I look forward to meeting these friends at each area conference and convention. However, our organization and the value of our attendance to our own state would not grow if we did not continually meet new people and exchange ideas with them.

Obviously I do believe that membership in NASBE is important to every State Board of Education if it is going to exert informed leadership in policy making within the individual states. Sometime it would be interesting to list the advantages as each of us see them and compare our lists.

George Bernard Shaw once suggested -- "It would be a very good idea if every citizen had to appear before a judge every ten years to justify his existence. If his life were worthless, he would be put to death. If he could convince the judge that by living he was contributing to society, he would be permitted to continue his life." It seems an unusual and bizarre idea, but periodically it is a good idea for any organization. We should meet the challenge -- Has our organization really contributed to education? And as your President -- my duty in this final address should be to try to justify to you my year as your presiding officer.

At the Convention last year, I promised to try to develop more member participation at the area conferences. Many of you had felt that there was not sufficient time to discuss individual state accomplishments and problems with the speakers and with each other. A real effort was made at the area conferences to have panels of State Board members react to speakers, and lead discussions, as well as present key subjects. You participated so enthusiastically that we are trying to use the same format, wherever possible, to some extent at this convention. I hope you like it. It will only be successful with widespread participation. We wish there had been more time after some of the provocative speakers. Then I hope you will continue the discussions on a person-to-person basis after the meetings. You each have so much to give -- and I might also add -- so much to learn.

Another goal set by your incoming President last year was to make this a friendly administration, with the NASBE

Board making increased effort to know more of you better. This, I believe we have done. Many of us attended each area conference and have had the opportunity of knowing you and others from your state much better. That spirit of friendliness has continued here. In the September FOCUS article, I discussed the personal letter and mailings sent by your President to all newly-elected or appointed State Board members as well as the personal letters of congratulations sent to newly-elected presidents or chairmen of State Boards of Education.

Your Board discussed the problems faced by a new State Board of Education member. I don't need to list them here for you. You were all new members at one time. You remember the confusion of trying to make wise decisions on topics on which you had very little background after discussions by veteran Board members using acronyms which were so much gobbledygock to you and title numbers which you didn't understand. And then do you remember your first NASBE Convention? These who had attended previous conventions greeted each other with warmth and affection while you felt very much like an outsider. We decided that this problem was universal enough that we could do a real service by preparing a pre-convention session for new State Board members. We had an excellent all day mini-seminar on Sunday for this purpose. In the morning, members of the NASBE Board participated and discussed some of the history, objectives and accomplishments of NASBE. Executive Secretary David Tronsgard discussed assessment and a paper which he has prepared on this subject. This will be revised on the basis of suggestions made, printed, and mailed to each of you. Extra copies will be printed for new members of Boards of Education this next year. The luncheon speaker was Byron W. Hansford, Executive Secretary of the national organization-Council of Chief State School Officers. He talked about the relationship between State Board of Education members and their Superintendents. The afternoon session dealt in depth with problems of boardmanship with time for questions and individual discussion. The interest and enthusiasm of participants exceeded our fondest hopes. We hope it met a real need and can be continued on an expanded basis in the future.

Some members expressed a concern that NASBE was not receiving adequate publicity in newspapers and on television. They felt that more effort should be spent in trying to increase the image of NASBE. At the beginning of the year Pat Hunt of Vermont who is a professional in this field was appointed Publicity Chairman for NASBE. She has sent out news releases

before each area conference and before this convention. We hope that you have seen some of these in your local papers. She also obtained television coverage of some events at this convention.

NASBE has been an increasingly important member of the Big Six -- the spokesman for education on national issues. It is composed, as most of you know, of the national officers of three professional organizations -- the CCSO (Council of Chief State Schools Officers), the AASA (American Association of School Administrators) and the NEA (National Education Association); with three lay organizations - the NSBA (National School Boards Association), the NCPTA (National Congress of Parents and Teachers Association) and our own NASBE. We are so pleased to have the presidents of three of these organizations at the head table with us tonight. Your President has represented you at all but one of the annual conventions of these organizations. In FOCUS we have reported on Big Six meetings this past year. Last week there was another meeting in Washington, D.C. Two from each organization met with President Nixon at the White House. If there is time, there will be a report on this tomorrow. It will be reported on very soon in FOCUS. I do want to re-iterate that your officers do not express their own opinions at these meetings but represent your position as stated in the resolutions adopted at our annual convention. That is one reason that tomorrow morning's session is so very important. You will be debating and adopting these important resolutions for the coming year.

This has been a good year for NASBE. Due to exceptional efforts by many Board members, we have more states belonging than ever before. This Convention is the largest ever held. According to the registration desk almost 250 have registered so far. Each year the conventions seem to get bigger and better. This is as it should be in a growing and dynamic organization. This should be a real stimulation to your new Board and a challenge to New York to improve on this convention.

Members themselves have shown an increased interest in NASBE and have freely expressed their opinions and criticisms. We asked for this at the beginning of the year. That's far better than apathy. As Dean Martin said during one of those silly resumes at the end of his weekly program -- "We asked 1000 people if they were apathetic -- 44 said yes -- 69 said no -- and 887 had no opinion." We don't want that kind of attitude about NASBE.

None of the accomplishments would have been possible without the dedicated effort of the fine Board which you elected last year. They have developed a splendid esprit de corps. The nominating and resolutions committees performed yeoman service. There was 100% attendance at their meeting in Denver. I wish you could have seen their energy and determination as they performed their charges. But officers and committees are only chosen to work for you -- the organization. So I would like to conclude with the paragraph with which I concluded my remarks at the convention last year as I assumed the presidency. "To be successful will require the interest and support of every one of you." That I certainly needed. I thank you for it. Now, back to my concluding remarks. "NASBE belongs to every one of you. It can be what you want it to be. Let's work together to make it what you think it should be." I do believe that jointly we have made this the best year that NASBE has ever had.

THANK YOU!

Address Delivered By
The Honorable David Hall
Governor of Oklahoma
at the Annual Convention of the
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 9, 1973

There is a grimness during these times:

---the disenchantment of Watergate;

---in Oklahoma, our own prison riot.

Yet, we look to the bright side. There is promise in Washington---because a more concerned electorate across this land is demanding higher morality among leaders.

In Oklahoma---we are demanding openness. And we are open ourselves. We believe this will become more commonplace nationwide and that our republic will be stronger.

As I flew over the smoldering ruins of our McAlester State Penitentiary last July, I reflected on the challenge of building a meaningful Corrections system for Oklahoma. I hope that---replacing the smoke of our old prison---will be the substance of a Corrections system that would emphasize correcting human lives. We started working on the problems long before the riot and fires. We remain committed to the cause.

Real corrections work starts in the classroom. That is why I championed counsellors for our elementary schools, that is why I sought funding for a program to detect early behavioral problems and the tools to correct the problems of people during the formative years.

Surely out of the tax reform fight and the victories for education we've had in Oklahoma, will come savings from crime tomorrow and relief from corrections problems during the 21st Century. Education is, indeed, an investment in the future.

Oklahoma is building upward, and we will meet today's Corrections crisis with creative solutions and answer prison problems with solid answers.

Likewise, our Nation will find new hope. Recently a commentator for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, Gordon Sinclair, delivered a talk that was inspiring to me and I'd like to share some of it with you. He said, and I quote:

"The United States' dollar took another pounding on German, French and British exchanges this morning, hitting the lowest point ever known in West Germany.

"It has declined there by 41 per cent since 1971 and this Canadian think it is time to speak up for the Americans as the most generous and possibly the least appreciated people in all the earth.

"As long as 60 years ago, when I first started to read newspapers, I read of floods on the Yellow River and the Yangtse in China. Who rushed in with men and money to help? The Americans did.

"They have helped control floods on the Nile, the Amazon, the Ganges and the Niger.

"This year the rich bottomland of the Mississippi was under water and no foreign land sent a dollar to help.

"Germany, Japan and to a lesser extent Britain and Italy, were lifted out of the debris of war by the Americans who poured in billions of dollars and forgave other billions in debts.

"None of those countries is today paying even the interests on its remaining debts to the United States.

"When the franc was in danger of collapsing in 1956, it was the Americans who propped it up and their reward was to be insulted and windled on the streets of Paris.

"I was there. I saw it.

"When distant cities are hit by earthquake it is the United States that hurries in to help---Managua, Nicaragua---is one of the most recent examples.

"So far this year, 59 American communities have been flattened by tornadoes. Nobody has helped.

"The Marshall Plan and the Truman Policy pumped billions of dollars into discouraged countries. Now newspapers in those countries are writing about the decadent warmongering Americans.

"I'd like to see just one of those countries that is gloating over the erosion of the United States dollar build its own airplane.

"Come on let's hear it!

"Does any other country in the world have a plane to equal the Boeing Jumbo Jet, the Lockheed Tristar or the Douglas DC-10?

"If so, why don't they fly them? Why do all international lines except Russia fly American planes?

"Why does no other land on earth even consider putting a man or woman on the moon?

"You talk about Japanese technocracy and you get radios. You talk about German technocracy and you get automobiles.

"You talk about American technocracy and you find men on the moon, not once but several times and safely home again.

"Even their draft dodgers are not pursued and hounded. They are here on our Canadian streets, most of them (unless they are breaking Canadian laws) are getting American dollars from Ma and Pa at home to spend here in Canada.

"When the Americans get out of this bind---as they will---who could blame them if they said: "To hell with the rest of the world."

"Let someone else buy the Israel bonds. Let someone else build or repair foreign dams or design foreign buildings that won't shake apart in earthquakes.

"When the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central went broke, nobody loaned them an old caboose. Both are still broke.

"I can name you 5,000 times when the Americans raced to the help of other people in trouble.

"Can you name me even one time when someone else raced to the American in trouble?

"I don't think there was outside help even during the San Francisco earthquake.

"Our neighbors have faced it alone and I'm one Canadian who is damned tired of hearing them kicked around.

"They will come out of this thing with their flag high. And when they do, they are entitled to thumb their nose at the lands that are gloating over their present troubles.

"I hope Canada is not one of these."

Those are the words of a Canadian broadcaster. They make me even more proud to be an American and redouble my determination to improve Oklahoma.

That is why I believe in education, in school teachers and in the work you are doing. You have my support in your work.

Within two decades to come, one out of ten people will be doing things for a living we don't even know about today. 60 per cent of the products to be made during this decade had not been invented in 1969.

By the end of this decade of the 70's, we will have added 30,000 new types of jobs to the dictionary of occupational titles, more than doubling the current list of 21,000. At the same time, dictionary editors will be removing such job titles as "rumble seat assembler."

The ancient Chinese philosopher Quan Tse put it very simply:

"If you plan for a year---plant rice.

"If you plan for ten years---plant trees.

"If you plan for 100 years---educate men!"

Address Delivered By
Richard L. Bye
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 10, 1973

Thank you, President Virla.

Less than a week ago at the Big Six Meeting in Washington, I claimed the position of a "poor boy from the country." This claim was immediately greeted with hoots of derision by Mr. DeLayo and Byron Hansford, as well as others in the room. It's a fact, of course, but these days, apparently, you have to prove facts. Since the Watergate hearings, the accepted means of claiming that you are a "Poor boy from the country" is to quote from the Bible; now while I will not quote from the Bible, I will follow the lead of Senator Sam Ervin in supporting my claim by alluding to the Bible.

In recent years there has been a great deal of Biblical research providing new insight into our scriptures with the result that the King James version of the Bible, which was a standard for so long, has been substantially rewritten. A modern edition of a portion of the Book of Exodus came across my desk the other day that goes something like this:

> "And the Lord came to Moses and said, "Moses, for you I have both good news and bad news! First, the good news - I have chosen you to lead the Israelites from Egypt. Now the bad news - The Egyptians will pursue you, but never fear! I will cause the waters of the Red Sea to part so that you can pass through them in safety; but, first you must file an Environmental Impact Statement."

Well, now that I stand here, I see that the seas of responsibility have parted and are towering above me and are about to descend. While, perhaps, I have not time to file an Impact Statement, it is my time to address to you some remarks entitled, "A Funny Thing Happened to Me While You Were on Your Way to the Airport."

Seriously, perhaps this meeting should not end without at least a brief review of some of my goals and priorities in line with the theme of this convention.

While federal dollars in education amount only to 7% or so of the total expenditures for elementary and secondary education, it appears to me that the problems created by uncertainty in the levels of federal funding, occupy disproportionately more of our time. Last week's Big Six Meeting, about which I will elaborate at a later time, indicated that there is a possibility of some early solution to the current impasse. I feel that your NASBE Board of Directors and officers must strive to keep communications open with both the administration and the Congress in an attempt to resolve the existing deadlock, so that we can get on with the business of planning our expenditures for the benefit of the school children of the country.

More at home, it would certainly be my aim to continue, in as an effective way as possible, the in-service role of NASBE in helping State Board members to become more effective and able leaders of educational thought and processes within their respective states. Our convention, which is about to adjourn, has been such an in-service experience and, certainly, the new Board Member conference instituted by President Virla has been such a meeting. Hopefully, we can continue this experience, and continue to make our area meetings and next year's convention valuable in-service sessions for State Board members.

While we shall continue to work with the other members of the Big Six in areas of common interest, it would certainly be my aim to improve the leadership role of State Boards of Education in other areas. Almost every state has large city school systems, and it is my experience that the degree of coordination and cooperation between State Boards of Education and large city school districts is relatively slight. I would hope that we can open some dialogue with the Council of Big City Schools relating to the problems of urban education to the end that NASBE members may better appreciate and provide leadership in solving educational problems besetting our major metropolitan areas. Similarly, I would hope to explore further cooperative adventures with ECS, which represents the educational interests of the political leaders of our states.

It would also be my aim, if your Board of Directors approves, to respond to your requests to improve communication between NASBE and the State Boards. FOCUS is a house organ - not a timely newspaper. To provide more timely news, we are discussing with ECS, the possibility of using some of their legislative briefings as inserts in FOCUS in an attempt to furnish you more current, up-to-date information.

I would like to improve the clearing-house function of NASBE, if it is at all possible to do so with the present limitations on staff. We will certainly continue and disseminate the information garnered by President Virla's study. If there are major developments of significance to State Board members, I would favor publishing and distributing a newsletter or bulletin, as Mrs. Krotz did following the Rodriguez decisions just prior to Western Area Conference last March.

A year ago, on this occasion, Mrs. Krotz stated that she hoped that she could today report that this past year was the best NASBE has ever had. Thanks to her effort and leadership, as well as your cooperation, her wish has been fulfilled completely. She has since confessed to me that at that time a year ago 'her tiny feet were frozen'. Today, as I sat by her side, awaiting my turn, I was again brought to realize that those tiny feet are encased in huge shoes that will be extremely difficult to fill. I only hope that in some measure I can.

Let me leave you with one final thought. Our universal system of free public schools was created by the people for the benefit of our children. I know of no other branch of local government where such substantial amounts of volunteer lay time are committed to governance. Nor do I know of any area of local government where the American people have made such a major commitment of their local resources for the support of this vital function. May we keep in mind, as one of our resolutions suggests, the reason for the existence of our schools - the children. They were not created for the benefit of State Board members, nor for that of local board members; most certainly our schools do not exist for the benefit of either administrators or teachers.

As we leave here today following fascinating and interesting debate on a number of issues, returning to states with varying statutory authority and carrying our separate views, I hope that we can concentrate, not on the areas of divisiveness exhibited by a few roll-call votes today, but rather on the far more numerous areas of common concern based upon our mutual commitment to the improvement of the education of America's public school children.

Thank you very much.

Address Delivered By
T. H. Bell, Superintendent
Granite School District, Salt Lake City, Utah
At The Annual Convention of The
National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon
October 10, 1973

A New Role for The Neighborhood Elementary School

The neighborhood elementary school sits in a strategic position to play a much more dynamic role than it is now playing in bringing comprehensive child development services to all children. As you well know, all across this great country we have thousands of elementary schools located in our centers of population--close to where the people live--reaching into millions of homes every day. We must, as I see it, take much greater advantage than is now being done to utilize these schools as a means of helping reach more fully the American dream of equality of opportunity for all. In my remarks to you today I hope to define a new role for the neighborhood elementary school as it functions as both an institution of learning and as a comprehensive child development center for the neighborhood.

I can think of no more influential audience than this annual convention of the nation's State Boards of Education as a place to suggest this new and greatly expanded role for the neighborhood elementary school. You are the leaders who have the power to define new roles and point to new policies and directions in education.

Following is my rationale for suggesting this new role for the neighborhood school:

The great ideal for American public education is to provide each student an opportunity to develop his full potential as a human being. We aspire to bring to full fruition all the latent talents of all children. This, I am sure, sounds a bit trite. But it is our aspiration for public education in America.

When we meet in some public gatherings--such as monthly PTA meetings across this huge nation--we stand, salute the flag, and recite the pledge of allegiance. We end this pledge with the well-known phrase: ". . . with liberty and justice for all." Over the past decade, we have been engaged as a nation in a struggle to bring full meaning to this highly significant phrase. In a sense, justice for all means equality of opportunity. It means education to meet our individual needs. It means education that will bring out the best that is in us . . . bring out the joy of fulfillment when we do our best.

I suggest that we are missing possibly our biggest potential educational lay-off and one of our highest priorities! Today's preschool children--those millions of toddlers in the residential neighborhoods of this country--are waiting to become our elementary school students in a few years. As educators we have an enormous stake in how these children develop physically, emotionally and intellectually. These are the ones whose lives we should be touching through an expanded role for the neighborhood school. If we are to help the next generation to surpass ours in intelligence, good health, positive attitudes, and over-all ability to cope with their problems we must begin at the origin point of these desired capacities.

We are learning more each year about the great potential--for good or bad--of those first few months and years of life in each human being. The intelligent, healthy, productive individual is nurtured in those very first life experiences. Unfortunately, the reverse of this is also so. All over the nation today, poor health, under-developed intellects, emotional and psychological problems are being nurtured in millions of preschool children. All of this is coming from the enormous impact of early life experiences that demean and detract from human potential . . . that rob the potential of small children.

We can ill afford these losses in human ability. The capacity of each person to care for himself, to be positively active in private and public matters, and to be productive in our economy touches all of us. To the extent that we fail to develop human potential we all lose. As you well know this amounts to millions of dollars in economic loss and added economic burdens.

Our neighborhood elementary schools should become the center of delivery of comprehensive child development services to the home and neighborhood. Just as these schools

are close to the people geographically, they should become much closer psychologically. As I see it, the elementary school can become the channel for delivery of these services for the following four reasons:

1. For geographic and strategic purposes.

In the urban ghetto, in the small rural town, and in the suburbs, the elementary school sits in this very strategic place where services can be dispensed to homes and where the child from birth to five years can feel the positive influence of the school with an expanded responsibility to function as a child development center and as an institution totally dedicated to child advocacy.

2. For the reason of promoting health.

The neighborhood school, in its role as a child development center, should provide public health services to preschoolers. Those regular check-ups to find medical and dental problems at the earliest possible time in the child's life will mean better health and a happier life. This service is, of course, particularly important in low-income areas where parents may lack both the knowledge and the financial means. By providing such services from the school we can avoid costly duplication of facilities and personnel. By providing these services, the child in the ghetto gets a better break early in his life when it counts the most for him and when it counts the most for society as a whole.

3. For social and rehabilitative reasons.

This neighborhood school--functioning as a comprehensive child development center--can also provide social and rehabilitative services offered by state and federal assistance programs. Both parent and child can be reached through the school. Both parent and child can learn to look to the school as a source of information and assistance. Public health and welfare personnel would, under this concept, coordinate their activities through the school and in harmony with the educational program.

4. For educational reasons.

The neighborhood school can also function as a center for early childhood education services in the attendance area it serves. Like physical, emotional, and attitudinal development, the intellectual strength of the

total organism is greatly influenced by how the twig is bent while a seedling and before it even begins to take the shape of a mature tree.

Dr. Benjamin Bloom, in his well-known studies of how human characteristics are formed, has called our attention to the need for better programs to build the child's cognitive powers long before he enters school. Bloom has concluded from his studies that when a trait is just beginning to unfold in the long and gradual process of growing to maturity that is when we can greatly influence the ultimate extent of its development. In this regard it is important to emphasize that some forces are always shaping the child's development. These are, of course, for good or ill. But they are working all through the child's early lifetime.

For example: When the child begins to understand words and their meaning, he is building cognitive power. His vocabulary development is very vital to much of what he subsequently learns. When the child first starts to understand spoken words is the time to positively influence this development. The child's experiences should be rewarding. His attitudes will be formed by these experiences and his entire power to spend the rest of his life in communicating with others can be greatly enhanced or damaged before he reaches school. Parents may be unwittingly causing retardation in the child's vocabulary development. If taught a few simple principles, however, they may easily turn this negative situation into a positive one.

The same applies to all aspects of the child's development of his abilities in almost every one of the complex functions that he will master. Persons in education, medicine, social and psychological service areas need to help parents to understand and utilize these great possibilities for human betterment. I place emphasis here on helping parents to help their preschool children because, as I see it, there is actually no other practical, cost-effective way to provide these vital services, in the quality and quantity needed.

I want to discuss further the role of the parent and the neighborhood elementary school in sponsoring home-based preschool education.

The home is the place for most of the early learning experiences of the child because that is where the child

because that is where the child will be spending over 95 percent of his time during the first five years of his life. School districts have a responsibility for sponsoring home-based preschool education. But school districts, I believe, should avoid extending formal institutionalized schooling down to ages two or three years. I don't think it is wise to extend formal public school education below kindergarten. The school should, however, assume responsibility for helping parents to offer a program in the home. I believe there are seven reasons for avoiding public schooling for 2, 3 and 4 years old:

1. School based early childhood education will be enormously expensive and not very productive.

2. Elementary school nursery programs can reach the child for no longer than two hours per day.

3. Children of two and three years of age are far too young and immature for the public school setting. (See much shock and frustration at age five.)

4. Early childhood education should begin no later than age four months. Needless to say, the school cannot offer nursery school for this age.

5. The home will still have the child for 22 hours each week day plus 24 hours per day on all other days when school is not in session.

6. Parent responsibility for early childhood teaching may be somewhat abdicated to the school when it must be primarily the duty of the parents.

7. There is more than a small chance that schools will do more harm than good by taking very small children from a mother's nurture at too early an age.--(Some authorities claim that even a poorly trained mother is better than the best school.)

The neighborhood elementary school should reach out into a neighborhood and train parents of preschool children the principles and techniques of early childhoold development. While the emphasis should be on early childhood education, parents should also receive training, advice, and assistance on the health and social aspects of child development with services coming through the school as a child development service center to the home. This will

obviously involve health and social service agencies working with school systems in development of the whole child approach.

The neighborhood school, in its new role as a child development center, should be alert to severe cases of child abuse and malnutrition. The child development center should be alert for indications of physical and mental handicaps in very small children so that early attention can ameliorate the severity of limitations from such handicaps. To this extent, the school as a child development center will truly begin to compensate somewhat for a bad home and unfortunate circumstance at birth. (This is not to imply that this proposed child development center can ever totally make retribution or compensation for a bad home, but it is to say that we will be much more effective than we currently appear to be.)

The neighborhood school library can become a source of information on child development to parents of preschoolers. Educational toy lending libraries, clinics and learning seminars can be housed at the school. With decreases in birth rates and declining elementary school enrollments, many of our schools will already have space available to house and host these services.

By placing emphasis on education, we will be reaching the minds of both parent and preschooler. By placing emphasis on the home we will, as I see it, accrue the following advantages:

(1) We will center in one place the services to be offered in helping parents to provide comprehensive child development service that touches the whole child.

(2) We will strengthen the home by placing responsibility where it belongs. We are all concerned about government as big brother. We would put our emphasis on each home doing as much as possible for child development with assistance when needed from the center.

(3) We will reach the child in the earliest months of life when the timing is right so that neglect and oversight to needs will be kept to a minimum.

(4) We will create and strengthen the proper working relationship between parent, child, and school.

(5) It will not cost as much money as would be the case with education, health and social service agencies working independently as they are now doing.

(6) Home-based preschool programs under school assistance will avoid premature placement of the child in the school before he is mature enough to leave the nurture of the home. It will also provide a natural bridge for the child to cross at less stress and pain when he reaches kindergarten age.

This program should be financed as part of the state aid programs for schools. The States should include comprehensive programs of financial support for home-based early childhood development under neighborhood elementary school sponsorship. This will involve funds for teaching parents in evening school programs, for providing both health services and health education programs, and for providing physical facilities at the school for social workers and mental health people to use as they carry out their responsibilities.

Those of us who control the schools should take the initiative to redefine the role and expand the mission of the neighborhood elementary school as a child development center. We should reach out to other agencies as well as to parents.

The major thrust of the States in the field of early childhood development should be to strengthen the homes, teach the parents and reach the toddlers through the school districts' neighborhood elementary schools. The State Boards of Education should take the lead in seeking state and Federal Legislation to implement this new role for schools. The potential is great, and it appears to me that, with all the current interest and attention on early childhood and child development, the time for action is now.

Thank you!

APPENDIX I

Minutes of Preliminary Business Meeting

By-Laws

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 West 26th Avenue, Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

MINUTES

Preliminary Business Meeting
October 8, 1973
Portland Hilton Hotel
Portland, Oregon

The Preliminary Business meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education was called to order at 12:15 p.m. President Virla R. Krotz was presiding. 48 voting states and territories were represented.

Convention - 1974

It was moved by Everett J. Penny of New York, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd of New Jersey and several others to award the 1974 convention of the National Association of State Boards of Education to New York state. Passed unanimously.

By-Laws Changes

The amendments to the By-Laws as printed in the August 1973 FOCUS were presented to the delegates by Richard L. Bye, Chairman of the By-Laws Committee (appended).

Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of Amendment I (Amend Article V, Section 5), paragraph (2), seconded by several. Passed unanimously.

Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of Amendment 2 (Amend Article IX, Section 2), seconded by several. Amendment was defeated by voice vote.

Amendment 3 was withdrawn by the By-Laws Committee.

Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of Amendment 4 (Amend Article IX, Section 4), seconded by several. Passed unanimously.

Richard L. Bye moved acceptance of Amendment 5 (Amend Article IX by adding a new section 4a), seconded by several. Passed unanimously.

Amendment 6 was withdrawn by the By-Laws Committee.

Adjournment

President Virla R. Krotz declared the meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

PROPOSED BY-LAWS CHANGES

(Extracted from Aug'73 FOCUS)

AMENDMENTS

1. Amend Article V, Section 5), paragraph (2) by adding the underlined language so as to read:

(2) The president-elect shall assist the president as may be requested by the president, shall serve as chairman of the By-Laws Committee, and shall preside in the absence of the president.

2. Amend Article IX, Section 2) by adding the language underlined so as to read as follows:

2) Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee shall consist of the immediate past president, who shall be chairman, and one member elected by vote of the delegates attending each area conference luncheon at the annual convention. The committee shall meet at least three months prior to the annual convention to select a slate of nominees for the offices of president-elect, vice-president, secretary-treasurer and three directors at large. The Nominating Committee shall circularize its report to the membership at least two months prior to the annual convention.

3. Amend Article IX, Section 3) by adding the underlined language to read as follows:

3) Resolutions Committee

The Resolutions Committee shall consist of the Vice President, who shall be chairman, one member appointed by the President from each area of the association, one member elected by vote of the delegates attending each area conference luncheon at the annual convention, and the president, ex-officio. The committee shall solicit resolutions from among the membership, meet at least three months prior to the annual convention to consider said resolutions, and circularize its report to the membership at least two months prior to the annual convention.

4. Amend Article IX, Section 4) by deleting the language herein omitted and adding the underlined language so as to read:

4) Finance Committee

The Finance Committee shall consist of the secretary-treasurer, who shall be chairman, the area vice-presidents, and the president, ex-officio. The committee shall review the financial situation of the association, its dues structures, its budget, investments and the manner in which the staff has conducted the business of the association and shall make whatever report it deems necessary to present to the association at the annual convention.

5. Amend Article IX by adding a new section 4a) to read as follows:

4a) By-Laws Committee

The By-Laws Committee shall consist of the president-elect, who shall serve as chairman, and two members appointed by the president. The committee shall review the By-Laws, and shall submit its recommendations for amendments to the membership at least two months prior to the annual convention.

6. Amend Article XI to eliminate therefrom the language herein omitted and add the underlined language so as to read:

Article XI Amendment

The By-Laws may be amended by a majority vote of the delegates voting at any annual convention provided that any change recommended by others than the By-Laws Committee shall also have been distributed to the membership by association headquarters at least 30 days before the convention. Amendments shall be effective upon their adoption.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

BYLAWS

(Adopted October, 1973)

ARTICLE I - Name

The name of the Association shall be the "National Association of State Boards of Education, Inc."

ARTICLE II - Purposes

The National Association of State Boards of Education shall:

1) Strengthen education in its important role in a democratic society by encouraging its continuous support by the public.

2) Develop, strengthen and improve the educational opportunities for all boys and girls in the public schools of the United States.

3) Provide the opportunity for State Boards of Education to study problems of mutual interest and concern on the state level; to exchange and disseminate information concerning educational programs and activities.

4) Improve communication and cooperation between State Boards of Education and all other lay boards legally responsible for education.

5) Establish and maintain an effective liaison with lay and professional educator groups in order that there be a concerted overall improvement in public education.

6) Foster and promulgate those educational programs and activities which are of nationwide interest and benefit.

7) Coordinate activities and studies toward a nationwide consensus on education.

ARTICLE III - Membership

1) Voting Members

Any state or territorial board having jurisdiction over elementary and secondary education may become a voting member of the Association upon payment of required dues. In states or territories not having boards of education, the chief state school officer may become a voting member of the Association upon payment by his state or territory of the required dues.

2) Associate Members

Any individual interested in the purposes of this Association may, upon payment of dues fixed by the Board of Directors, become an associate member and may attend all conventions and conferences of the Association and may speak on any subject, but shall have no vote.

3) Honorary Life Members

The Board of Directors of the Association may confer honorary life membership upon past presidents of the Association and upon other individuals who by their actions have demonstrated a high degree of devotion to the purposes of the Association. Honorary members may attend all conventions and conferences of the Association and may speak on any subject, but shall have no vote.

ARTICLE IV - Organization

1) Official Address

Each voting member shall file with the Association an official address to which all official notices of the Association shall be mailed. The Association shall annually in June verify the official address.

2) Areas

The Association shall be divided into areas, with the states and territories to comprise each area to be determined by the Board of Directors.

ARTICLE V - Officers and Board of Directors

1) Officers

a) Designated - The officers of the Association shall be a president, president-elect, vice-president, secretary-treasurer and immediate past president.

b) Election - The president-elect, the vice-president and the secretary-treasurer shall be elected by majority vote of the delegates attending an annual convention. The president-elect shall automatically become president the year succeeding his election.

c) Term - Each officer shall take office at the close of an annual convention, shall serve for a term of one year or until his successor is qualified and amy not succeed himself to the same office.

d) Qualifications - To be eligible to hold office in the Association an individual shall be a member of a dues-paying state or territorial board having jurisdiction over elementary and secondary education.

2) Area Vice-President

a) Designated - An area vice-president shall be elected at a caucus of the delegates from each area during the annual convention of the Association.

b) Term - The area vice-president shall take office at the close of the annual convention at which he is elected, shall serve for a term of one year or until his successor is qualified and may not succeed himself in office. No state shall have an area vice-president more than one time in three years.

c) Election - Election shall be by majority vote of the delegates attending such caucus.

d) Vacancy - In event that a vacancy should occur in the office of area vice-president, the Executive Committee shall designate a member from the area to be area vice-president, who shall serve until the next annual convention.

3) Directors at Large

a) Designation - Three directors at large shall be elected from among the members of the boards of member states and territories.

b) Term - Directors at large shall take office at the close of an annual convention, shall serve for a term of one year or until his successor is qualified and may not succeed himself in office.

c) Election - Directors at large shall be elected by majority vote of the delegates attending an annual convention.

4) Board of Directors

The Board of Directors of the Association shall consist of the officers, the area vice-presidents and the directors at large.

5) Duties

a) Officers - The officers will perform those duties customarily assigned to the offices held. In addition:

(1) The president shall preside at the annual convention and at other conventions of the Association, shall be chairman of the board of directors, shall make appointment to committees, and shall otherwise be responsible for the conduct of the business of the Association.

(2) The president-elect shall assist the president as may be requested by the president, shall serve as chairman of the By-Laws Committee, and shall preside in the absence of the president.

(3) The vice-president shall assist the president as requested by the president, shall preside in the absence of the president and president-elect and shall be chairman of the Resolutions Committee.

(4) The secretary-treasurer shall be chairman of the Finance Committee and shall have general responsibility for the development of records of proceedings and financial accounts that will insure an orderly conduct of the business of the Association. The secretary-treasurer shall furnish a bond in such amount as may be required by the board of directors.

(5) The immediate past president shall be chairman of the Nominating Committee and shall assist the president as the president may require.

b) Area Vice-Presidents - The area vice-president shall preside as chairman of the annual area conference and any other area conferences which may be held, shall be responsible for organization of such conferences and shall perform any other duties in his area to further the purposes of the Association.

c) Directors at Large - Directors at large shall assist the president and other officers as the president may require.

d) Board of Directors - The board of directors shall be responsible for the management of the Association between annual conventions. The Board may delegate this authority as appropriate to the Executive Committee.

6) Nominations

Officers and directors at large shall be nominated by the Nominating Committee as hereinafter provided. In addition thereto, nominations for the office of president-elect, vice-president, secretary-treasurer and director at large may be made by written petition signed by the voting delegates of eight or more states.

7) Vacancies

In event a vacancy should occur among any of the officers or directors at large, the Board of Directors shall appoint a member of the board of a member state or territorty to fill such vacancy until the next annual meeting.

If the state board of education of any state or territory shall be dropped from or withdraw from membership in the Association and if a member of such board shall be an officer, area vice-president or director at large of the Association, a vacancy shall exist and be filled as herein provided.

If any officer or other member of the board of directors shall remove or be removed from membership on the state board of education of his state or territorty by virtue of resignation, expiration of term of office or otherwise, he shall no longer be eligible to hold office with the Association and a vacancy shall exist and be filled as provided herein.

8) Executive Secretary

a) Designation - The Board of Directors shall employ an executive secretary to serve at the pleasure of the Board, at such compensation as may be determined by the Board.

b) Duties - The executive secretary shall (1) be responsible for the day-to-day operation of the business of the Association, (2) hire such clerical and stenographic staff as may be necessary to conduct the business of the Association, subject to employment policies which may be set by the Board, (3) maintain a complete and accurate record of the proceedings of all meetings of the Association, its areas and its committees, (4) be the custodian of the funds of the Association and receive and pay all invoices for the Association, for which duties he shall furnish bond in such amount as may be required by the Board of Directors.

c) Attendance at Meetings - The executive secretary may attend all meetings of the Association, its areas and its committees and may speak on any subject, but shall have no vote.

ARTICLE VI - Meetings

1) Annual Convention

a) Called - Annual conventions of the Association shall be held at such times and in such places as may be determined by the delegates at an annual convention. Such duty may be delegated to the Board of Directors.

b) Notice - Notice of annual convention shall be given by Association headquarters, in writing, to all members at least 90 days prior to the convention.

c) Meeting with other organizations - An annual convention or meeting may be held in connection with conventions or meetings of other educational organizations.

d) Quorum - One-third of the voting members shall constitute a quorum and the action of a majority of the delegates voting shall be the action of the Association.

2) Area Conferences

a) Called - Area conferences shall be held annually at such time and place as may be determined by the area vice-president, in consultation with the area states, the headquarters office, and the board of directors.

b) Notice - Notice of area conferences shall be given by Association headquarters, in writing, to all members at least 30 days prior to the conference.

c) Direction - Area conference shall be directed by the area vice-president, who may appoint such committees as may be necessary for the organization of the conference, and shall be coordinated by the Executive Secretary.

d) Quorum - One-third of the voting members within an area, as of June 30, of the preceding year, shall constitute a quorum. The Association shall provide each area vice-president and each state and territorty within an area, at least 30 days before an area conference, a list of member states and territories qualified to send voting delegates to an area conference. The action of a majority of the delegates voting at an area conference shall be the action of the conference.

3) Delegates

For each annual convention and each annual area conference, each member state and territory shall designate, on forms provided by the Association, one of its members to be its voting delegate and an alternate delegate; such delegates shall register with the credentials committee which the chairman of the convention or conference shall designate; voting on propositions before such conventions or conferences shall be by registered delegate only.

4) Board of Directors Meetings

a) Called - The Board of Directors shall hold its annual meeting immediately following the annual convention. There shall be a Board meeting preceding the opening of the annual convention. Other meetings may be held at the call of the President as the business of the Association may require.

b) Notice - Notice of meetings of the Board of Directors except for the meeting held at the close of an annual convention shall be given by Association headquarters, in writing, at least 30 days before the date of such meetings. Agendas for such meetings shall be mailed to all members of the Board of Directors at least 10 days before a meeting.

c) Quorum - A majority of the members of the board of directors shall constitute a quorum and the action of a majority of the members voting at a meeting shall be the action of the board.

ARTICLE VII - Dues

The annual dues for membership in the Association shall be in such amount as may be recommended by the Board of Directors and approved by the delegates of any annual meeting and shall become due and payable at such time as shall be fixed by the delegates.

ARTICLE VIII - Fiscal Year

The fiscal year for the Association shall be November 1 through October 30.

ARTICLE IX - Committees

1) Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall be composed of the president who shall be chairman, president-elect, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and the immediate past president. The committee shall assume responsibility for the management of the affairs of the Association as requested by the Board of Directors.

2) Nominating Committee

The Nominating Committee shall consist of the immediate past president, who shall be chairman, and one member elected by vote of the delegates attending each area conference. The committee shall meet at least three months prior to the annual convention to select a slate of nominees for the offices of president-elect, vice-president, secretary-treasurer and three directors at large. The Nominating Committee shall circularize its report to the membership at least two months prior to the annual convention.

3) Resolutions Committee

The Resolutions Committee shall consist of the vice-president, who shall be chairman, one member appointed by the president from each area of the Association, one member elected by vote of the delegates attending each area conference, and the president, ex-officio. The committee shall solicit resolutions from among the membership, meet at least three months prior to the annual convention to consider said resolutions, and circularize its report to the membership at least two months prior to the annual convention.

4) Finance Committee

The Finance Committee shall consist of the secretary-treasurer, who shall be chairman, the area vice-presidents, and the president, ex-officio. The committee shall review the financial situation of the association, its dues structures, its budget, investments and

the manner in which the staff has conducted the business of the association and shall make whatever report it deems necessary to present to the association at the annual convention.

a) By-Laws Committee - The By-Laws Committee shall consist of the president-elect, who shall serve as chairman, and two members appointed by the president. The committee shall review the By-Laws, and shall submit its recommendations for amendments to the membership at least two months prior to the annual convention.

5) Terms of Office

Members appointed by the president to committees of the Association shall be appointed for terms expiring at the following annual meeting.

6) Quorum

A majority of a committee shall constitute a quorum and the action of a majority of the members present at a committee meeting shall be the action of the committee.

ARTICLE X - Rules of Order

Robert's Rules of Order, Revised, shall govern all conventions, conferences and meetings of the Association.

ARTICLE XI - Amendment

The By-Laws may be amended by a majority vote of the delegates voting at any annual convention provided that any change recommended by others than the By-Laws Committee shall also have been distributed to the membership by Association headquarters at least 30 days before the convention. Amendments shall be effective at the close of the convention at which adopted.

APPENDIX II

Minutes of Annual Business Meeting

1973-74 Budget

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 West 26th Avenue, Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

MINUTES

Annual Business Meeting
October 10, 1973
Portland Hilton Hotel
Portland, Oregon

The Annual Business Meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education was called to order at 9:00 a.m. by President Virla R. Krotz. A roll call made of all the voting delegates by Cynthia Cunningham, the Credentials Committee Chairman, showed 44 states and territories present and 7 absent at the beginning of the meeting.

Proposed Budget 1973-74

Muriel I. Shepard moved, seconded by Isabelle B. Thomasson of Alabama for the acceptance of the proposed budget 1973-74. Motion carried with no objections.

Proposed Dues Revision

Muriel I. Shepard moved, seconded by Isabelle B. Thomasson for the acceptance of the proposed dues revision of twenty-five percent across all categories.

Preston C. Caruthers of Virginia moved, seconded by William M. Potter of Pennsylvania, a substitute motion to amend the proposed dues schedules to provide that no state will have a step increase for the next two fiscal years (explanation: step increase will not be assessed until 1976-77). Passed 23 to 21. The chair ruled the dues increase passed.

Ben R. Howell of Texas moved, seconded by Preston C. Caruthers that the ruling of the chair be sustained. Motion carried with two states opposed.

Resolutions Committee Report

Robert H. McBride, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, read the resolutions (appended along with supplementary report).

Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of Preamble as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Esther R. Landa of Utah. The motion was carried unanimously. (Note: The Index and Identity numbers are from July FOCUS and Resolutions Committee Supplementary Report)

73-1-A. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance, seconded by William M. Potter. Preston C. Caruthers moved an amendment to delete this resolution in its entirety, seconded by Ben R. Howell. The motion was carried.

73-1-B. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Lewis E. Stieghorst moved an amendment to delete words in last sentence after the word advance "on a level at least equal to the appropriations of the previous year." Resolution as renumbered (73-1-A should read: "The most effective use of federal funds for education requires advance planning and preparation. In subsequence, applicable federal legislation should provide for a minimum three-year authorization, with funds to be appropriated one year in advance." The amendment passed with one nay.

73-1-C. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution (renumbered to 73-1-B), seconded by Preston C. Caruthers. The motion was carried.

73-1-D. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution (renumbered to 73-1-C), seconded by William M. Potter. Lewis E. Stieghorst moved an amendment to revise resolution but motion died for lack of a second. Motion carried with Colorado opposed.

73-1-E. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution (renumbered to 73-1-D) as amended in supplementary report, seconded by J.P. Kneece of South Carolina. As revised, motion carried unanimously.

73-1-F. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution (renumbered to 73-1-E), seconded by William Potter. Motion was carried unanimously.

73-1-G. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution (renumbered to 73-1-F), seconded by Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. of New York. Motion was carried unanimously.

73-1-H. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution (renumbered to 73-1-G) as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Lynn Simons of Wyoming.

Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. moved an amendment, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd to change the words of the supplementary

report so as to read: "National Association of State Boards of Education feels that the proposed decentralization of Federal educational administration my well interfere with attainment of the President's stated goal of "providing continued Federal financial support for our schools while expanding state and local control over basic education decisions." Amendment passed by a 21 to 20. Motion carried unanimously.

73-1-H. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried unanimously.

73-1-I. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. The motion carried.

73-1-J. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Lynn Simons. The motion carried unanimously.

73-1-K. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report (73-1-L), seconded by Ben R. Howell. The motion carried with three states opposed: Wyoming, Georgia and North Carolina.

73-1-L. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion passed.

73-2-A. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. The motion carried with three states opposed: Wyoming, Georgia and North Carolina.

73-2-B. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Ben R. Howell. Motion carried unanimously.

73-2-C. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. The motion carried.

73-2-D. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. William M. Potter moved, seconded by Preston C. Caruthers, to insert the word "age" on the last line, before the word "sex", so as to read, "Each state and local educational agency should assure to qualified persons equal opportunity for employment and advancement in state and local agencies, without regard to age, sex, race or national origin." Amendment was defeated with eight states voting in favor and 32 states opposed. The motion carried.

73-2-E. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Lewis E. Stieghorst of Colorado moved an amendment,

seconded by Preston C. Caruthers to delete the word "must" on first line and replace it with the word "should" and add the words "such as" in place of the word "of" on the third line. Motion to amend carried. Motion carried with Nevada opposed.

73-2-F. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Preston C. Caruthers moved, seconded by William M. Potter to amend the supplementary report by deleting the words "more nearly" on the second to the last line. The amendment passed. Motion carried.

73-2-G. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Esther R. Landa of Utah. Motion passed with two states opposed: Colorado and Michigan.

73-2-H. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Reverend Benjamin Franzinelli of Nevada. Motion was carried.

73-3-A. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Stephen S. Jenkins, Jr. of Arizona. Motion passed with Georgia opposed.

73-3-B. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution seconded by Preston C. Caruthers. Motion was carried.

73-3-C. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Motion carried.

73-3-D. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Motion carried.

73-3-E. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Motion carried with two states opposed: Michigan and Rhode Island and one state abstaining: New Jersey.

73-4. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplenentary report, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Motion carried unanimously.

73-4-A. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

73-4-B. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Ben R. Hotell. Motion carried unanimously.

73-4-C. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Barbara Dumouchelle of Michigan. The motion carried unanimously.

73-4-D. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Preston C. Caruthers moved an amendment, seconded by Ben R. Howell to change the word "Jobs" on 4th line to "skills". Amendment carried. Motion carried.

73-4-E. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

73-4-F. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Barbara A. Dumouchelle. Motion carried.

73-4-G. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Motion carried.

73-4-H. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

73-4-I. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

73-4-J. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Preston C. Caruthers. Motion carried.

73-4-K. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

73-4-L. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Motion carried.

73-4-M. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

73-5-A. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Isabelle B. Thomasson. Motion was carried unanimously.

73-5-B. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

73-5-C. Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of resolution, seconded by Calvin J. Hurd. Motion carried.

Proposed Priority Areas for the National Association of State Boards of Education

Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of deletion as amended in supplementary report, seconded by Isabelle B. Thomasson. Motion carried.

Note About Past Resolutions

Robert H. McBride moved acceptance of same, seconded by William M. Potter. Motion carried.

Courtesy Resolutions A & B. Two courtesy resolutions (appended) were read by Robert H. McBride. Resolutions passed by acclamation.

Report of Area Vice Presidents and Future Area Meetings

Western Area Vice President Cynthia Cunningham reported that Grant L. Anderson of Washington was elected Western Area Vice-President for the year 1973-74. The area conference will be held in Seattle, Washington, March 31-April 1-2, 1974.

Southern Area Vice President Isabelle B. Thomasson reported that Jesse H. Bankston of Louisiana was elected Southern Area Vice-President for the year 1973-74. The area conference will be held in New Orleans, Louisiana, March 10, 11 and 12, 1974.

Northeast Area Vice President Calvin J. Hurd reported that Arline "Pat" Hunt of Vermont was elected Northeast Area Vice-President for the year 1973-74. The area conference will be held in Burlington, Vermont on May 6, 7, and 8, 1974.

Central Area Vice President Harry O. Lytle, Jr. reported that Richard Hilborn of North Dakota was elected Central Area Vice-President for the year 1973-74. The area conference will be held in Bismarck, North Dakota on April 22, 22, and 23, 1974.

Virla R. Krotz thanked the Area Vice-Presidents and the directors-at-large for all the wonderful work they did during 1972-73.

Report of Nominating Committee. Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr., Chairman of the Nominations Committee, read the slate of nominated officers. He moved acceptance of the report, seconded by Isabelle B. Thomasson of Alabama and asked that the Secretary-Treasurer cast a unanimous ballot for the slate and that the new officers be declared elected. The motion carried unanimously.

Virla R. Krotz thanked the Nominating Committee for the wonderful work done during the year 1972-73.

The annual business meeting was adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
Tentative Budget
November 1, 1973 - October 31, 1974

ESTIMATED INCOME

Dues outstanding	$ 77,850	
Estimated Interest Income	2,000	
Total estimated income		$ 79,850

EXPENDITURES

Headquarters Staff:		
Executive Secretary Salary	$ 25,200	
Clerical Salary	7,500	
Employee Benefits (1)	5,100	
Headquarters Maintenance:		
Office Rent	4,200	
Office Expense (2)	8,200	
Audit	450	
Bond Insurance	275	
Travel:		
Officers, Board, Staff, Committees	17,000	
Publications:		
FOCUS and Interim Newsletters	4,400	
Meetings:		
Annual Convention	2,500	
Area Conferences	4,000	
Contingency Reserve (3)	1,025	
Total expenditures		$ 79,850

NOTE:

(1) Includes Social Security Tax
(2) Includes maintenance and repair of equipment
(3) Available cash savings at November 1, 1973, to start the new fiscal year are estimated at $15,472.85

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 West 26th Avenue, Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

FINANCIAL REPORT - BUDGET YEAR 1972-73

November 1, 1972 to September 30, 1973

	Budget	Collected
Dues	$ 75,550.00	$ 73,600.00
Interest and Other Income	1,800.00	2,227.13
	$ 77,350.00	$ 75,827.13

EXPENSES

	Expended	Balance	Budget
Executive Secretary	$ 22,000.00	$ 2,000.00	$ 24,000.00
Clerical Salary	6,416.74	583.26	7,000.00
Employee Benefits	3,417.67	1,282.33	4,700.00
Office Rent	3,723.94	476.06	4,200.00
Office Expenses	6,783.26	716.74	7,500.00
Travel	13,801.02	3,198.98	17,000.00
Publications	3,200.05	1,049.95	4,250.00
Annual Convention	33.96	2,466.04	2,500.00
Area Conferences (including unbudgeted income)	2,401.76	598.24	3,000.00
Audit	400.00	50.00	450.00
Bond insurance	188.00	87.00	275.00
Contingency Reserve	- 0 -	2,475.00	2,475.00
	$ 62,366.40	$ 14,983.60	$ 77,350.00

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION
2480 W. 26th Avenue, Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

FINANCIAL REPORT
(Cash Summary)

Cash in Bank (checking acct.)	$ 7,272.78
Passbook savings	21,405.14
Savings & Loan Certificates	60,000.00
Total Cash on Hand	$ 88,677.86
Dues collectable	18,150.00
Total Cash	$106,827.86
Less estimated expenses Oct. 1-31, 1973	5,397.44
Estimated Total Available 1973-74	$101,430.42
Budget 1973-74	79,850.00
Total cash end of 1972-73	$ 21,580.42

Budgeted Liabilities

Dues collected for 1973-74	$ 59,700.00
Estimated budgeted expenses, Oct. 1-31, 1973	5,397.44

Executive Secretary	$ 2,000.00
Clerical Salary	583.26
Employee Benefits	590.00
Office Expenses	849.00
Travel	505.18
Publications	370.00
Convention	500.00
	$ 5,397.44

APPENDIX III

Courtesy Resolutions

COURTESY RESOLUTION A

Adopted at the 1973 Annual Business Meeting
of the National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon, October 10, 1973

WHEREAS, the Oregon State Board of Education has been a most gracious host for the 1973 Annual Meeting of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE), and

WHEREAS, the Board has exemplified the warm and generous hospitality of the great Northwest, and

WHEREAS, every need of the NASBE delegates has been met, including good weather, magnificent scenery, imaginative gifts, and fine entertainment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the members of NASBE offer its sincere thanks to be Oregon Board of Education, their spouses and Superintendent Parnell for so ably hosting the 1973 NASBE Annual Meeting.

COURTESY RESOLUTION B

Adopted at the 1973 Annual Business Meeting
of the National Association of State Boards of Education
Portland, Oregon, October 10, 1973

WHEREAS, the staff members of the Oregon Department of Public Instruction have provided helpful and efficient service to members of the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE) at the 1973 Annual Meeting, and

WHEREAS, the attendance at the 1973 NASBE Annual Meeting is the largest in history, and

WHEREAS, the success of the meeting has resulted significantly from the service of the Oregon Department of Public Instruction staff,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the National Association of State Boards of Education offers its sincere thanks to all members of the Department staff for the magnificent assistance to NASBE members in making the 1973 Annual Report such a resounding success.

APPENDIX IV

Policy Resolutions

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

REVISIONS TO PROPOSED 1973 NASBE RESOLUTIONS

Based on written and verbal inputs from NASBE members at the Resolutions Committee meetings of October 8 and 9, 1973, the following changes are proposed in the 1973 Resolutions as sent to the membership in the July issue of FOCUS:

Note: Revisions are underlined.

Preamble - At the beginning of the second sentence insert this phrase:

Recognizing that the most important ingredient of quality education is the student, the National Association....

73-1-E - Add emphasis by inserting the word "Federal" as the first word in E.

Because of new Federal actions proposing program management decentralization of many U.S. Office of Education functions, the Committee recommends the following:

73-1-H - The President's stated goal of "providing continued Federal financial support for our school while expanding state and local control over basic education decisions" is of paramount importance. However, NASBE feels that the proposed decentralization of Federal educational administration will interfere with attainment of this goal.

Renumber the current sections of 73-1; e.g., the current H becomes I, I becomes J, etc.

73-1-L (Formerly K) - As urged by Oregon, make this section more specific as follows:

All federally funded education or training programs should be consolidated under the appropriate Federal or state education (not Labor) agency with the state as prime sponsor of all Federally funded manpower programs.

73-2-E - Change the second paragraph to read:

We urge State Boards of Education to take the initiative in proposing remedies to the legislative and executive branches of government for solving such education problems.

In the light of recent court decisions, State Boards of Education, in conjunction with state agencies constitutionally empowered, should assume leadership roles in revising educational funding systems to provide more nearly an equal educational opportunity for each child, regardless of residence.

73-3-E - Delete the first phrase ending with the word student (moved to Preamble).

73-4 - Change the opening sentence to read:

The National Association of State Boards of Education considers these curriculum items important for comprehensive education:

73-4-B - For emphasis change as follows:

Special Education programs should guarantee that all exceptional children (including the gifted) be provided education suitable to preparing them for satisfying, meaningful and productive lives.

73-4-J - To broaden this resolution, the committee offers the following:

Inclusion of history, culture and the arts of all civilizations are viewed as necessary to a well rounded education and is extremely relevant to our world society.

73-5-A - Add in the last part:

computer assisted instruction

PROPOSED PRIORITY AREAS

Delete this section.

Submitted by:
Preston C. Caruthers, Virginia
Stephen S. Jenkins, Jr., Arizona
Ellen Moyer, Maryland
Ben R. Howell, Texas
Arlene "Pat" Hunt, Vermont
Louis R. Smerling, Minnesota
Robert H. McBride, Delaware (Chairman)
James M. Connor, South Carolina

PROPOSED RESOLUTIONS 1973

73-1
FEDERAL FINANCING OF EDUCATION

Increasing population mobility and dependency upon education for national progress demands broader sources of funding for public education; the National Association of State Boards of Education supports the following:

A. The total share of federal support for education should be increased to at least one-third of total educational expenditures within the next 3 years.

B. The most effective use of federal funds for education requires advance planning and preparation. In subsequence, applicable federal legislation should provide for a minimum three-year authorization, with funds to be appropriated one year in advance on a level at least equal to the appropriations of the previous year.

C. General federal educational revenue sharing should be implemented in addition to categorical grants.

D. Categorical grants for education are needed in clearly-defined, critical areas of unique federal responsibility and urgent national concern.

E. Funds should be distributed on an equitable basis taking into consideration financial resources, need, and effort at state and local levels. Responsibility for determining specific expenditures should rest with local school districts where needs are best evaluated.

F. The states must demonstrate full accountability for funds, but not programs, on revenue sharing grants and must demonstrate both fiscal and program accountability for categorical funding.

G. The state education agency legally constituted to carry out the state's responsibility for education must receive and administer the appropriated federal funds in order to be accountable for funds and/or programs.

H. In view of demands for renewal, as well as accountability for results of educational programs, continuing federal discretionary support for state department staff personnel in areas such as research, evaluation, planning and similar functions is vital to improve education.

I. Since added costs imposed on schools in compliance with emerging constitutional concepts divert state and local funding from classrooms, the federal government should provide substantial additional funding to defray mandated non-educational support functions.

J. Appropriation legislation (state and federal) should deal exclusively with educational objectives and programs and not include amendments or riders dealing with subjects foreign to the educational purposes of the legislation.

K. All federally funded education or training programs should be consolidated under the appropriate federal or state education agency.

L. Educational advisory groups should advise the responsible state education agencies and should not engage in duplicative administrative functions which infringe on those assigned to the responsible state agency.

73-2
STATE ORGANIZATION AND FINANCE

In this crucial area, the National Association of State Boards of Education recommends these concepts:

A. To provide the most efficient and effective administration of state educational programs, major policy and supervisory responsibility should be placed in the hands of a State Board of Education composed primarily of lay citizens with authority to appoint the Chief State School Officer.

B. Continued cooperative efforts with Education Commission of the States in areas of mutual concern is vital. As part of this growing rapport, the Governors of each state are urged to include at least one State Board of Education member as a commissioner to the Education Commission of the States.

C. Paramount is the principle of equal educational opportunity for all students. As a necessary initial step, we urge each state to have a defined quality education program for its students and undertake to obtain the necessary resources so that all young people, in fact, obtain the identified components of quality education.

D. Each state and local educational agency should assure to qualified persons equal opportunity for employment and advancement in state and local agencies, without regard to sex, race or national origin.

E. Program and fiscal support must be provided by the states to school districts containing a high concentration of children with problems of health, cultural deprivation and family-support when these problems lead to low academic achievement.

We urge educators to take the initiative in proposing remedies to the legislative and executive branches of government for solving such education problems.

F. In the light of recent court decisions, states should assume leadership roles in revising educational funding systems to provide more nearly an equal educational opportunity for each child, regardless of residence.

G. To implement more equitable education funding for public elementary and secondary schools, we urge increased reliance on progressive sources of revenue.

H. Because the foundation of our American system of education is free public education, we oppose the use of public funds, tax deductions, tax credits, voucher plans, or other programs to support non-public education under any circumstances which would jeopardize the welfare, stability, or adequate support of the system of public education.

73-3
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATIONAL PERSONNEL

The National Association of State Boards of Education endorses these principles:

A. States are encouraged to participate in cooperative certification efforts such as the *Interstate Certification Project*

B. States should develop actuarially-sound *Reciprocal Interstate Retirement Plans* for professional educational personnel.

C. Further *strengthening is needed of programs for preparation and professional renewal* of educational personnel including exploration of evaluative performance criteria.

D. Creditable *teacher renewal programs* require cooperative development among federal, state and local education agencies.

E. Recognizing that the most important ingredient of quality education is the student, we recommend that tenure laws which overemphasize rights of educational personnel should be replaced with procedures which provide for fair dismissal, while protecting educators against arbitrary and capricious actions. Dismissal procedures for educators should be based upon acceptable standards of performance, on systems of fair evaluation and due process, but without over-reliance on time service criteria.

73-4
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The National Association of State Boards of Education considers these curriculum items as high priority:

A. Varied and effective learning techniques should be employed so that every educable person will be able to read. The *Right to Read Program* deserves special support.

B. *Special Education* programs should guarantee that all exceptional children be provided education suitable to preparing them for satisfying, meaningful and productive lives.

C. *Career Education*, as an integral part of the educational program, should develop:

(1) respect for work and workers
(2) motivation to learn by emphasizing the satisfaction in useful and stimulating careers
(3) Awareness of alternative careers

D. *Occupational, Vocational and Technical Education* are necessary parts of local and state comprehensive education programs. These programs should train persons to competence in salable jobs and provide opportunities for retraining as circumstances and interests change.

E. *Consumer Education* is necessary for all students in order to prepare them to be intelligent users of goods and services.

F. *Bilingual Education* should be encouraged in schools where there are significant numbers of non-English speaking students.

G. *Foreign Language* courses should lead to conversational fluency.

H. *Early Childhood* Education should start as early in life as proven desirable by research and experience with responsibility for the formal educational components assigned to the public schools.

I. *Environmental Education* should emphasize the need to preserve the natural quality of life balanced by recognition of mankind's need for natural resources, energy, goods and services.

J. Inclusion of *history, culture and languages of the non-western world* in texts and instruction is extremely relevant, in light of recent world events.

K. Comprehensive *health services and education* for all students must stress a positive attitude toward current major national problem areas such as alcohol and drug abuse and venereal disease.

L. *Continuous learning* programs are advocated in order to provide opportunities, regardless of age, to participate in new learning experiences dictated by changing life styles, career needs and interests.

M. Education for *conversion to the metric system* is urged for citizens of all ages in view of imminent changeovers in industry and government.

73-5
IMPROVED USE OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

The National Association of State Boards of Education favors:

A. Greater use of advanced *communications technology* in education is recommended, especially such innovations as education by television satellite and closed circuit television.

B. Greater deployment of resources to develop and to assure effective utilization of improved *instructional technology* is both important and necessary.

C. Full year-round, day and evening *use of school facilities* for educational and community purposes should be supported by state and local boards of education.

PROPOSED PRIORITY AREAS FOR THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION

The following areas are designated as priorities in working with other education organizations and goals which the National Association of State Boards of Education will attempt to achieve.

A. Improved *federal and state financing*, with particular emphasis on increased and more timely federal funding.

B. Necessary revisions in *state/local funding* to better equalize educational opportunities for all students.

NOTE ABOUT PAST RESOLUTIONS

Certain areas covered by the National Association of State Boards of Education's 1972 and past resolutions have not been presented in 1973 because of one or more of these reasons:

A. They are no longer applicable to the present.
B. They are not of pressing importance.
C. They have been achieved or implemented. (The National Institute of Education, for example, is operational. Carl H. Pforzheimer, Jr. of New York, a NASBE member, is on the advisory committee.)
D. Certain aspects of past resolutions, such as accountability, are included in the preamble to the proposed resolutions for 1973.

NASBE

RESOLUTIONS 1973

PUBLISHED BY **NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE BOARDS OF EDUCATION**

ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL BUSINESS MEETING, OCTOBER 10, 1973, PORTLAND, OREGON

Education is and should be among our nation's highest priorities. Recognizing that the most important ingredient of quality education is the student, the National Association of State Boards of Education asserts its belief in the youth of this country and the force of public education in maintaining and emphasizing our American way of life. For public education to continue to fulfill its obligations, we must have positive and effective leadership. The National Association of State Boards of Education pledges itself to this leadership role.

We recognize the need for State Boards of Education to determine educational priorities, to formulate coordinated plans, and to codify policies under which State Departments of Education can most effectively and efficiently operate. We must establish a mechanism for equitable distribution of state and federal monies, determined by educational program priorities. A meaningful method of determining accountability to guarantee that funds are translated into the satisfaction of real educational needs must be a foremost objective.

Programs should stress education in basic skills, should create self-awareness, should provide for responsible and productive citizenship, should generate respect for our American heritage and should inspire students to grow and learn throughout their lifetimes. In these ways students become contributing members of society.

The National Association of State Boards of Education, therefore, addresses itself to adequate financing, effective administration, and equal educational opportunities.

The National Association of State Boards of Education further recommends that a reassessment of the goals and functions of public education be made by its members and that broad based citizen involvement and participation by the school community — students, parents, teachers, administrators — is a necessary component of goal setting and program development.

73-1
FEDERAL FINANCING OF EDUCATION

Increasing population mobility and dependency upon education for national progress demands broader sources of funding for public education; the National Association of State Boards of Education supports the following:

A. The most effective use of federal funds for education requires advance planning and preparation. In subsequence, applicable federal legislation should provide for a minimum three-year authorization, with funds to be appropriated one year in advance.

B. General federal educational revenue sharing should be implemented in addition to categorical grants.

C. Categorical grants for education are needed in clearly-defined, critical areas of unique federal responsibility and urgent national concern.

D. Federal funds should be distributed on an equitable basis taking into consideration financial resources, need, and effort at state and local levels. Responsibility for determining specific expenditures should rest with local school districts where needs are best evaluated.

E. The states must demonstrate full accountability for funds, but not programs, on revenue sharing grants and must demonstrate both fiscal and program accountability for categorical funding.

F. The state education agency legally constituted to carry out the state's responsibility for education must receive and administer the appropriated federal funds in order to be accountable for funds and/or programs.

G. National Association of State Boards of Education feels that the proposed decentralization of Federal education administration may well

interfere with attainment of the President's stated goal of "providing continued Federal financial support for our schools while expanding state and local control over basic education decisions."

H. In view of demands for renewal, as well as accountability for results of educational programs, continuing federal discretionary support for state department staff personnel in areas such as research, evaluation, planning and similar functions is vital to improve education.

I. Since added costs imposed on schools in compliance with emerging constitutional concepts divert state and local funding from classrooms, the federal government should provide substantial additional funding to defray mandated non-educational support functions.

J. Appropriation legislation (state and federal) should deal exclusively with educational objectives and programs and not include amendments or riders dealing with subjects foreign to the educational purposes of the legislation.

K. All federally funded education or training programs should be consolidated under the appropriate Federal or state education (not Labor) agency with the state as prime sponsor of all Federally funded manpower programs.

L. Educational advisory groups should advise the responsible state education agencies and should not engage in duplicative administrative functions which infringe on those assigned to the responsible state agency.

73-2
STATE ORGANIZATION AND FINANCE

In this crucial area, the National Association of State Boards of Education recommends these concepts:

A. To provide the most efficient and effective administration of state educational programs, major policy and supervisory responsibility should be placed in the hands of a State Board of Education composed primarily of lay citizens, with authority to appoint the Chief State School Officer.

B. Continued cooperative efforts with Education Commission of the States in areas of mutual concern is vital. As part of this growing rapport, the Governors of each state are urged to include at least one State Board of Education member as a commissioner to the Education Commission of the States.

C. Paramount is the principle of equal educational opportunity for all students. As a necessary initial step, we urge each state to have a defined quality education program for its students and undertake to obtain the necessary resources so that all young people, in fact, obtain the identified components of quality education.

D. Each state and local educational agency should assure to qualified persons equal opportunity for employment and advancement in state and local agencies, without regard to sex, race or national origin.

E. Program and fiscal support should be provided by the states to school districts containing a high concentration of children with problems such as health, cultural deprivation and family-support when these problems lead to low academic achievement.

We urge State Boards of Education to take the initiative in proposing remedies to the legislative and executive branches of government for solving such education problems.

F. In the light of recent court decisions, State Boards of Education, in conjunction with state agencies constitutionally empowered, should assume leadership roles in revising educational funding systems to provide an equal educational opportunity for each child, regardless of residence.

G. To implement more equitable education funding for public elementary and secondary schools, we urge increased reliance on progressive sources of revenue.

H. Because the foundation of our American system of education is free public education, we oppose the use of public funds, tax deductions, tax credits, voucher plans, or other programs to support non-public education under any circumstances which would jeopardize the welfare, stability, or adequate support of the system of public education.

73-3
PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PERSONNEL

The National Association of State Boards of Education endorses these principles:

A. States are encouraged to participate in cooperative certification efforts such as the *Interstate Certification Project.*

B. States should develop actuarially sound *reciprocal interstate retirement plans* for professional educational personnel.

C. Further *strengthening is needed of programs for preparation and professional renewal* of educational personnel including exploration of evaluative performance criteria.

D. Creditable *teacher renewal programs* require cooperative development among federal, state and local education agencies.

E. We recommend that tenure laws which overemphasize rights of educational personnel

should be replaced with procedures which provide for fair dismissal, while protecting educators against arbitrary and capricious actions. Dismissal procedures for educators should be based upon acceptable standards of performance, on systems of fair evaluation and due process, but without over-reliance on time service criteria.

73-4
EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

The National Association of State Boards of Education considers these curriculum items important for comprehensive education:

A. Varied and effective learning techniques should be employed so that every educable person will be able to read. The *Right To Read Program* deserves special support.

B. *Special Education* programs should guarantee that all exceptional children (including the gifted) be provided education suitable to prepare them for satisfying, meaningful and productive lives.

C. *Career Education,* as an integral part of the educational program, should develop:

(1) respect for work and workers
(2) motivation to learn by emphasizing the satisfaction in useful and stimulating careers
(3) awareness of alternative careers

D. *Occupational, Vocational and Technical Education* are necessary parts of local and state comprehensive education programs. These programs should train persons to competence in salable skills and provide opportunities for retraining as circumstances and interests change.

E. *Consumer Education* is necessary for all students in order to prepare them to be intelligent users of goods and services.

F. *Bilingual Education* should be encouraged in schools where there are significant numbers of non-English speaking students.

G. *Foreign Language* courses should lead to conversational fluency.

H. *Early Childhood* Education should start as early in life as proven desirable by research and experience with responsibility for the formal educational components assigned to the public schools.

I. *Environmental Education* should emphasize the need to preserve the natural quality of life balanced by recognition of mankind's need for natural resources, energy, goods and services.

J. Inclusion of *history, culture and the arts of all civilizations* is viewed as necessary to a well-rounded education and is extremely relevant to our world society.

K. Comprehensive *health services and education* for all students must stress a positive attitude toward current major national problem areas such as alcohol and drug abuse and venereal disease.

L. *Continuous learning* programs are advocated in order to provide opportunities, regardless of age, to participate in new learning experiences dictated by changing life styles, career needs and interests.

M. Education for *conversion to the metric system* is urged for citizens of all ages in view of imminent changeovers in industry and government.

73-5
IMPROVED USE OF TECHNOLOGY AND FACILITIES

The National Association of State Boards of Education favors:

A. Greater use of advanced *communications technology* in education is recommended, especially such innovations as education by television satellite, closed circuit television and computer assisted instruction.

B. Greater deployment of resources to develop and to assure effective utilization of improved *instructional technology* is both important and necessary.

C. Full year-round, day and evening *use of school facilities* for educational and community purposes should be supported by state and local boards of education.

NASBE OFFICERS
1973-74

OFFICERS

President . . . . RICHARD L. BYE
615 Sellwood Building
Duluth, Minnesota 55802

Past President . . VIRLA R. KROTZ
44 Monte Vista Road
Orinda, California 94563

President-Elect . . ROBERT H. McBRIDE
1500 Spring Lane
Wilmington, Delaware 19809

Vice-President . . JAMES M. CONNOR
P.O. Box 544
Kingstree, South Carolina 29556

Secretary-Treasurer . ESTHER R. LANDA
5006 So. 1034 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84117

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

DAVID T. TRONSGARD
Headquarters
2480 W. 26th Avenue
Suite 215-B
Denver, Colorado 80211

AREA VICE PRESIDENTS

Northeast . . . ARLINE "PAT" HUNT
Morgan, Vermont 05853

Central . . . . RICHARD HILBORN
Durbin, North Dakota 56023

Southern . . . . JESSE H. BANKSTON
5700 Florida Blvd, Suite 318
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

Western . . . . GRANT L. ANDERSON
1080 Daniels Drive
Tacoma, Washington 98466

DIRECTORS AT LARGE

PRESTON C. CARUTHERS
3800 North Military Road
Arlington, Virginia 22207

BEN R. HOWELL
1225 Cincinnati
El Paso, Texas 79902

CALVIN J. HURD
1139 East Jersey Street
Elizabeth, New Jersey 07201

National Association of State Boards of Education

a commitment to:

- **Strengthen education in its important role in a democratic society by encouraging its continuous support by the public.**
- **Establish and maintain an effective liaison with lay and professional educator groups in order that there be a concerted over-all improvement in public education.**
- **Improve communication and cooperation between State Boards of Education and all other lay boards legally responsible for education.**
- **Foster and promulgate those educational programs and activities which are of nationwide interest and benefit, and to coordinate activities and studies toward a nationwide consensus on education.**
- **Provide the opportunity for State Boards of Education to study problems of mutual interest and concern on the state level; to exchange and disseminate information concerning educational programs and activities.**
- **Develop, strengthen and improve the educational opportunities for all boys and girls in the public schools of the United States.**

State Boards Stand Together

Fifty six of the fifty seven States and Territories have elected to place major, state-level, supervisory, and policy making responsibility for public elementary and secondary education in the hands of a state board of education. Varying in size (3 to 24) and in procedures of selection, boards also vary in composition of membership and in scope of authority. In Hawaii, for instance, the State Board is the only school board for the public schools. The New York Regents are responsible for all education, private and public, nursery schools through graduate schools. Some state boards are exclusively comprised of lay citizens, others have professional educators as members and some have state governmental officials as regular or ex-officio members. Regardless of their structural differences, however, all state boards are unified in their desires for quality education. Furthermore, state boards stand at the fulcrum of our decentralized system of public education which is, of course, the most powerful force for the preservation of our central American traditions.

Recognizing the crucial need for state boards of education to provide the "cutting edge" leadership to all facets of public education and realizing that state board members could learn much from those in similar capacities throughout the United States, board members from eleven states came together in 1959 to form the initial membership of NASBE.

Today the Association, with 48 of 50 states and five territories participating, is a force on the national educational scene. It represents state perspectives while serving as a source of leadership and information. The organization, through its membership, is attempting to find solutions to the educational problems facing all levels of government and is especially interested in enhancing the emerging importance of states.

The affairs of NASBE are handled by an elected Board of Directors and financed by dues from member states and territories. Policies of the Association are set by the membership at the annual convention held each fall. A full-time staff is headquartered in Denver, Colorado.